THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. IV JANUARY, 1922 No. 19

EDITORIAL

The New Year dawns on a world where hope grows more robust than heretofore. It is not of the kind we call optimism, but that soberer sentiment which blesses the effort to see truly and to do right. Even if disappointed, wholly or in part, by the event, it is not therefore fickle; for it involves an experience of guidance and direction which abides. We see in the statesmanship of the agreements over Ireland and the Pacific an answer to the prayers of the Church; and with thanksgiving we go forward to the future.

In the Church, too, we see much cause for the same kind of hope. English people take a long time to adjust themselves to a new order of things; but already the Parochial Church Councils are awakening among the laity fresh interest and sense of responsibility, and by consequence a fresh desire for knowledge. The National Assembly has been criticized for debating instead of legislating. Apart from the fact that debate is the approved method of legislating in this country, it is serving an invaluable educational purpose; and the space now devoted in the Press—both in London and in the provinces—to Church affairs is a sign that the public want to know what we mean. Even the temporary distress of the Central Church Fund has its brighter side; for in parish after parish local effort is being made, and successfully made, to deal with the most urgent of all financial problems—the maintenance of the clergy.

v.4
1921:1

THE IDEA OF THE EUCHARIST

III.

A body hast thou prepared me.

It is mere sentimentalism to repeat the words of institution at the consecration of the Sacred Elements, especially the words, "This is My Body," "This is My Blood," unless He who spoke them was God. The faith of Catholic Christendom is that God took a real human body and a real human mind, that in and through them He might bring the Divine Will into effective expression in the world of men; and that, as He used the material particles of the Body which was born of Mary in order that men might be brought into fellowship with God, so He uses the consecrated Host and the consecrated Wine to serve His Will and to be a channel by which He comes to succour and sustain His friends. These become, in that sense at least, His Body and His Blood.

"In that sense at least"; the words, "This is My Body," are in some sense non-literal, and must be so interpreted. That does not mean that they do not describe a reality, but that this reality belongs to the spiritual world, the world of faith, of the ideal, the world of values; the world of poetry rather than of prose; of meaning rather than of mere fact; of drama rather than of science. But just for that reason we must be careful not to put any easy, fanciful interpretation of our own on those words of our Lord's. They are His words, not ours. And the men who first heard them could have had no conception of a symbol which was not in some sense the reality it expressed; they were spiritual realists who knew nothing of "mere symbols,"* and from that day to this orthodox Christians have understood His words "without any allegory or metaphor or trope or figure."† And yet the world is still waiting for an adequate explanation of the infinite wealth of meaning implied in those blessed words, "This is My Body."

The New Testament understands the Body of Jesus Christ in a threefold sense. First, there is the Body that was born of Mary, that men saw and touched in Galilee and Judæa, that was hungry and thirsty and tired, that touched the blind and the leper to heal them, that was scourged and crucified, that was dead and buried, that rose again a spiritual body (in St. Paul's phrase), triumphing over death and the grave. Then there is the less literal usage by which the Pauline letters call the Church Christ's Body. "Ye are the Body of Christ," the

* Loisy, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

† Tunstall, *Concerning the Reality of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ in the Eucharist* (1551).

Apostle says to the Corinthians, "and each of you is one of His organs;" and the Ephesian letter describes the Church as "His Body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all." This metaphor has become naturalized in Christian speech, and has been a commonplace of theology from that day to this. Then, thirdly, there is the application of the phrase to the Blessed Sacrament. "The bread which we break," asks St. Paul, "is it not the communion of the Body of Christ?" It surely does not need argument that if we are to begin to understand what our Lord meant when, at the Holy Supper, He said, "This is My Body," we must first ask what is meant by saying that the Flesh which He took from the Virgin Mary was "His Body"; and then what is meant by calling the Church "the Body of Christ," and applying what we have so learnt of the meaning of "the Body" to the Holy Eucharist.

First, then, Christ's natural body was the link between Him and the human race. He took our nature upon Him. He, God from all eternity, became Man. And the means, the instrument, the expression of His membership of the race, His oneness with mankind, was His real human body. In and through His body that mysterious influence of humanity which we call "heredity" touched Him; He was the Son of David. All the human and material influences which make up man's environment, the appeal of education to the eye and the ear, the influence of food and sleep and climate and work and weariness on thought and emotion—His body was the link and channel and opportunity for all these. And it was His limitation and opportunity among all these. His limitation, as perhaps our bodies limit us. When we say that His earthly ministry was confined to an insignificant corner of the Roman Empire, that He saw the world through the eyes of a Jew of the first century of our era, it is of the body and its limitations that we are thinking. But the body was His opportunity also, His opportunity to make His love concrete and particular and visible; for He could only save and uplift the human race, not from outside but from within; He could only make the eternal sacrifice of the life of God a dynamic ideal in human evolution by coming down from heaven and becoming incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and being made man. Without a body, a person cannot work in this world. If a man, for example, wished to bring about any change in the government of the country, he could only begin to do it by using his body: his hands to write letters and pamphlets and articles; his tongue to speak; his feet to walk from one influential person to another; his brain to plan and co-ordinate and choose means for his ends. That is what Christ's natural body was. It was His instrument for effecting

336349

His will in the world, for persuading and healing and helping. It was the expression of God's love for mankind.

Although we rarely try to express our feeling in words, all men, the most sophisticated as well as the most primitive, have an instinctive recognition of the mystery of the human body. It is not only that it is fearfully and wonderfully made, but much more that it is the inexplicable companion of the soul. "Flesh is blessed above all other substances because it is informed by life, that force of which there is such a stupendous abundance on this earth, which has such divine attributes as will and consciousness, which has so dark a past and so mysterious a future."* There is an indefinable difference, in the relation between one mind and another, brought about by what might seem the spiritually irrelevant accident of "bodily" presence. Through his writings, a teacher imparts his thoughts to the minds of others; but present in the flesh, there is an immediate contact of spirit with spirit, force is transmitted, none the less real because we try to describe it by such words as "spiritual" or "personal." And if we ask "how," we can only say that it is conveyed *sacramentally.*

As we think over all this, and our minds go back to that Face which has left no remembered picture for the comfort of mankind; to those Eyes which looked with anger at the proud and with reproach at His friend, which wept at the grave of Lazarus; to those Hands which wrought "the creed of creeds in loveliness of perfect deeds"; the conviction becomes clear that the whole meaning of the Body is that it is *His :* it means renewal and help and a courage that is full of grace, because it is *Love's Body.* So when St. Paul, under the overmastering impression of Christ's Resurrection as the first-fruits of a new life for humanity, says, "It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body," he is thinking not of any distinction between material and immaterial, but of the body now emancipated from all other limitations into complete subjection to the purposes of Christ's spiritual activity. The limitations of time and space are fallen away; it obeys freely and fully Love's purposes and Love's needs.

And the Church is the Body of Christ in exactly the same sense, not merely a school founded by a great Teacher who died two thousand years ago, but the extension of the Incarnation so that the history of the Church is "the fifth Gospel," the record of His acts in the world. The Church, the fellowship of Christian believers, is His Body in the sense that it is the link between Him and the human race, the means, the instrument, the expression of His oneness with mankind, His opportunity to make His love concrete and particular and

* Rebecca West, *The New Statesman*, p. 388, July 9, 1921.

visible, the external, tangible embodiment in the world of the sacrificial glory of the life of God, working in us to draw us completely into it. The Church is the Body of Christ, His instrument for effecting His will in the world, for persuading and healing and helping, the expression of God's love for mankind. Through the Church Christ communicates Himself to Christians; through the Body of His Spirit we are brought into immediate contact with the present Christ; it is His "bodily presence," in and through it the force of His Spirit is transmitted and felt. "Ye are the Body of Christ, and individually members thereof." That means, as the Rev. W. E. S. Holland has put it, that He has no hands to do anything with but our hands, no feet to go anywhere with but our feet, no tongue to speak words of courage and forgiveness but ours, no heart to agonize, no brain to plan, for humanity, but ours. The whole meaning of the Church is that it is His; *His* Body, not ours; not the Church of England, as by law established, but established by Christ, and endowed by Him; His Body, the fullness of Him who filleth all in all.

What is true of Christ's natural Body, and of the Church, His mystical Body, has its application to the Holy Bread of the Eucharist. In the same sense, and for the same purpose, for which our Lord became incarnate in human flesh two thousand years ago, He embodies Himself in the Bread and Wine at each Eucharist. And the same religious ideal which is expressed in calling the Church Christ's Mystical Body is described in calling the consecrated Bread His Sacramental Body; the Bread is His Body, because it is the sacrament of our unity in Him. The corporate aspect of the Eucharist as expressing the unity of the faithful, taught by St. Paul and reiterated again and again by St. Augustine, foreshadowing the ultimate unity of mankind, and quickening the hope of immortality by its emphasis on fellowship with the faithful departed as well as with the present, is one aspect of the connection of all sacramentalism with the maintenance of a common life in a society, and gives meaning to calling the Bread His Body. They who are Christ's mystical Body feed on His sacramental Body, and we become that on which we feed.* St. Peter Lombard sees in the sacrament the *res contenta et significata*—the Body and Blood—and the *res significata et non contenta*—the unity of the Church.†

The Bread is His Body because it has no meaning except that which He gives to it; the consecration means a change of use and ownership. It means *Christ*, the fellowship of His

* "If you have received well, you are that which you have received" (St. Augustine, Sermon 227).

† Srawley: Article "Eucharist" (to end of Middle Ages), *E. R. E.*, v. 558.

grace, the claim of His love, the aim and method by which those must live who are His. It is the means through which He communicates Himself to His disciples, makes Himself felt, communicates His power to them. "The Holy Communion is explicitly the communication of His personality and eternal life."*

The Body which was born in Bethlehem and crucified on Calvary expressed always the glory of God's humility, the strength of God's patience, the victory of His limitless love. The Church which is His Body is the fellowship of those who offer themselves to live by His Spirit. (What else can it mean? My body lives by my spirit; His Body must live by His Spirit.) The Bread consecrated to be His Eucharistic Body is the expression of God's life, which is sacrifice. His Body is ever broken, His Blood is shed for ever.

For millions of Christians the Real Presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar is the most powerful reality in their religious experience. "The heart of Catholicism for its most spiritual children is its belief in the peculiar presence of God within the Sacrament, and it is this that makes the Catholic Church mean so much more to the good Catholic than the Protestant meeting-house can ever mean to anyone. To some minds the contrast is enormous. George Tyrrell tells us that at an early age he felt 'the difference between an altar and a communion table is infinite.'"† It is surely not necessary to add that such a belief and such an experience do not imply, necessarily, a belief in Transubstantiation. Mr. Keble's *Eucharistic Sacrifice* and Dr. Waterman's *Eucharistic Body and Blood*, to take but two easily accessible examples, affirm one and deny the other. At the same time, it may be pointed out that the scholastic doctrine, as taught by the Roman Church and its best instructed theologians, is as far as possible from being materialistic. Dr. Hastings Rashdall says that by *substance* was meant "the impalpable universal which was held to inhere in every particular included under it,"‡ and the later scholastics taught that the *substance* of the consecrated Host (the Body of Christ, that is) is real only to thought, is spiritual in character, and is a food that belongs to the soul, not to the body. Cardinal Newman in a famous passage reminded his readers that our Lord "is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit. We do not know how; we have no parallel to tell 'how' in our experience. We can only say that He is present, not according to the natural manner of bodies, but sacramentally."§ It has been held, indeed, that

* Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross Roads*, p. 276.
† Pratt, *op. cit.*, p. 296; Tyrrell, *Autobiography*, i., p. 98.
‡ Rashdall, *Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, i. 46.
§ J. H. Newman (1877), *Via Media*, ii. 220.

what *transubstantiation* means is that we continue to perceive the bread and wine, but that we must not continue to behave as in the presence of bread and wine, because it has become something which makes it our duty to act differently.* There are those who do not understand that *matter* is as much an unsolved enigma as spirit; for them to say that Christ's Body is *really* present would mean a danger of unworthy thoughts of the sacraments, degrading them to the sphere of magic, or of mascots and other non-moral superstitions. For others it is almost equally dangerous to say that the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar is a *spiritual* Presence, for Western minds are prone to materialism, and we say, "I shall be with you *in spirit*" when we mean, "I shall not be there at all"; and we have to remind ourselves that spirit, though a great mystery, is ultimately the only reality. What is certain is that Christ uses the consecrated Bread and Wine in the Eucharist for His own spiritual purposes, that they are, therefore, His Body and Blood; that they who, by faith, feed on Him become also, and in proportion to the quality of their faith, the servants of His purpose, the means that He uses for the accomplishment of His will. They are, in other words, His Body.

IV.

Go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice.

The Eucharist as an actual present achievement, "an event in the natural world that produces effects in the supernatural world," and also as rooted in the Incarnation, "ordained by Christ Himself," is described in the words recorded by St. Paul, "Do this in remembrance of Me." The word ποιεῖτε comes into the New Testament with a twofold set of associations. It is associated with the word ποιητής. A poet is a maker, a doer. To the Greeks, the poet was *the* maker, *the* doer, *the* producer *par excellence*. They believed in the creative power of words, and it was in the context of such assumptions that the greatest philosopher of the New Testament dared to write: "The Word was God . . . all things were made by Him." We cannot spend long on such thoughts without being reminded of that climax and crisis of the Communion Office, when the words are spoken, and what before was bread and wine is the Body and Blood of Christ. Then, as St. Athanasius says, "The Word descends upon the bread and the cup, and His Body comes to be."†

But ποιεῖτε has other associations. In the Greek version

* Le Roy, *Dogme et Critique*, p. 260.

† Some Fathers—*e.g.*, SS. Ambrose and Jerome—did not fear to say that the Body of Christ "is made." "This body which we make is that which was born of the Virgin" (St. Ambrose, *De Mysteriis*, 9).

of the Old Testament it has intimate association with sacrifice and sacrificial ideas, although St. Justin is the first Christian writer to interpret ποιεῖν in a sacrificial sense. The word ἀνάμνησις, "memorial," occurs four times in the Old Testament with sacrificial associations, and only once without. The occasion on which our Lord spoke these words was the Passover, "the most . . . strictly sacrificial of all the feasts."* For any Greek-speaking Jew, therefore, the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me," could only mean, "Offer this as My memorial." The consciousness of that implication of the phrase has lived on in the Church, as when the Council of Trent decreed that the Apostles were made priests by the words, "Do this in remembrance of Me,"† and as when the priest lifts the consecrated Host and Cup, as he uses the words, as a sign that the worshipping Church is presenting the sacrifice of her glorious Lord before the Father in heaven.

The sacrificial character of the Holy Communion, which has been part of the faith of the Church since primitive times, cannot be understood apart from the history of sacrifices, especially in the Old Testament, and from the context of the phrase, "The Body of Christ." The general application of the word "sacrifice" is to a kind of service which, outwardly at least, is entirely different from any part of Christian worship. The full ceremonial of the golden age of Judaism meant cruelty and filthiness and horror, an altar ever burning, the temple courts filled with smoke, a sacred shambles with its priestly butchers, and—blood everywhere. That is the development of instincts as universal as they are primitive, implying child-like—sometimes childish—conceptions of God and religion. At first the sacrifice seems to have been thought of as a gift or present to God, and to have been offered with the same variety of motives as leads men to give presents to their fellows. Homage, gratitude, and need are among the motives of which there are plentiful examples. If God accepts the gift it becomes a sacrament of fellowship, and especially, as the consciousness of sin becomes more explicit, a sacrament of restored fellowship. This aspect of the sacrifice as "communion" is particularly clear in the sacrificial meal. In the early times, almost up to the Exile, all ordinary festal sacrifices were accompanied by a feast.‡ This feast was "before Jehovah." After God had received His portion, the worshippers had their share. So the sacrifice strengthened the sense of God's presence and friendliness.

Beneath all this, and more difficult for a modern man to understand, was the thought of the mysterious efficacy of

* F. D. Maurice, *The Kingdom of Christ* (edit. 1883), vol. ii., pp. 61, 62.
† XXII. Session, Canon ii.
‡ *Cf.* 1 Sam. i. 4, 5.

blood. The story of the Passover, for example, reveals man's faith in blood as a protection from evil; and the "blood of the covenant," and the blood poured out as an offering to God, bring again the thought of fellowship into prominence. In human worship, everywhere, sacrifice has had a central place; and always its meaning has been a combination of fellowship with God and obedience to His commands.

It is one of the main glories of the Hebrew religion that it was not content merely to accept this universal practice; it accepted sacrifice as an institution, and moralized it. From the very beginning the bond between Jehovah and His worshippers was envisaged as something more than a merely natural bond; it was moral. "I have *chosen* you," says Jehovah.* And the challenge of the greater prophets to the ceremonial practice of their time emphasized the moral meaning of sacrificial worship. Divine sanction was claimed for the sacrificial system, and yet Amos could say, in the name of God, "I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies. Though ye offer Me burnt offerings and your meat offerings, I will not accept them: neither will I regard the peace offerings of your fat beasts . . . but [and this is the explanation !] let justice run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream."† There were people who forgot that Jehovah was an ethical being, a righteous God. The oppressor and the wicked brought their offerings, but these did not express any fellowship between the life of the worshipper and the revealed character of his God. Others thought to buy the favour of God with gifts. But the prophets, lifting religion, with wonderful certainty and unanimity, on to the ethical plane, denounced all such notions. God only accepts sacrifices as the symbol of mercy and obedience. "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit." What He requires of man is not ceremonial purity, but truth and justice; not sackcloth and ashes, but penitence and forgiveness; not cult, but conduct, or, rather, only that worship which is the expression of a righteous life. "Wherewith shall I come before Jehovah, and bow myself before the God of heaven ? Shall I come before Him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old ? Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams, with tens of thousands of rivers of oil ? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul ?" Here is the very climax of zeal ! Here are men who agonize with longing for the Divine favour, and are willing to yield their hearts' dearest treasures to obtain it. But this is not what God wants. "It has been told thee, O man, what is good. Yea, what doth Jehovah seek from thee, but to

* Hag. ii. 13. † Amos v. 21-24.

do justice, and to love kindness, and to humble thyself to walk with thy God ?"* When the ceremonial offering expresses such a spirit, it is acceptable on high.

The New Testament writers interpret the death of Christ as a sacrifice, the symbol and the instrument of the restoration of fellowship between God and man, the consummation of human obedience. He reveals the ideal meaning of the primitive intuition that without shedding of blood there is no putting away of sin. He gave Himself to death to put away from sin, and so made sin appear more sinful. The Old Testament sacrifices are but types and shadows of His supreme self-offering. That is the ordinary New Testament view, but occasionally there comes the profounder thought that type and antitype alike, the sacrifice of Calvary as well as those of the old dispensation, find their real significance in the eternal reality which they represent. The Book of the Revelation speaks of " the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." The worship of heaven is represented as an adoring recognition of what man can only describe as the age-long pain of the Divine heart over human sin; of the Divine Love, at infinite cost to Himself, achieving reconciliation between God and man. The Lamb with His throat cut† which the writer sees enthroned does but make more vivid God's agony for man's sin. Calvary, it has been said, is the projection on the plane of time of that eternal suffering.

The ethical interpretation of this must be emphasized. Christ's sacrifice avails for us as it avails in us. We must share His sacrifice, *morally*. We can plead His passion in so far as it inspires us to try to express it in lives of brotherhood and self-denial and sacrifice.

In this historical tradition of positive sacrifice morally interpreted, the Holy Communion has an inevitable place. In the Eucharist the Christian Church offers the sacrifice of sons to the Father in the name of Christ. " Though God needs nothing from man, He accepts the recognition of His Fatherhood from loyal and free hearts."‡ The Holy Eucharist is more than all that the Old Testament sacrifices were. It is no longer a type or shadow or outline of Christ's all-prevailing offering, but one with it, the vehicle of a mysterious reality, *one* with the sacrifice of Christ eternal in the heavens. This offering of the Lamb of God is the great act of Christian worship; here the fellowship of man with God is consummated and made real; the last word of prophecy is fulfilled: " In every place incense shall be offered unto My name, and a pure offering."§

* Mic. vi. 6-8.
† Rev. v. 6, ἀρνίον . . . ὡς ἐσφαγμένον. *Cf.* Liddell and Scott.
‡ Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 210.
§ Mal. i. 11.

And here again the moral interpretation is essential and all-important. The God whom Jesus reveals can only be worshipped in spirit and in truth. We can offer Him nothing apart from ourselves. "The Christian God is the Being to whom nothing can be given, since He has all things—except your will."* When we offer the sacrifice of the altar, we offer ourselves to Him, in union with the offering of His Son. "We must bring our bodies to be offered with His body . . . we cannot be apart from the sacrifice. *We ourselves are to be in the sacrifice.* . . . Can two be offered together unless they be agreed? Can a body stained with impurity be put with Christ's body? Can a soul stained with pride and selfishness be put with Christ's soul? We must remember that Christ is not offered instead of us, but for us, and He cannot be offered for us unless He is in us and we in Him."† So the Prayer-Book Liturgy combines these inseparable things in its prayer of oblation: "We . . . entirely desire Thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice . . . and here we offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto Thee." But the classical expression of this teaching is to be found in St. Augustine. In the Eucharist the Church offers itself, and Christians offer themselves. "If you are the body and members of Christ, it is the sacrifice of yourselves that is laid on the table of the Lord."‡ "It is shown to the Church that in what she offers, she herself is offered." "The sacrifice is the man consecrated and devoted to God, dying to the world, that he may live to God." St. John Chrysostom also is very bold when he says that the offerings of sheep and oxen, blood and steaming fat have been done away, "and in their place the reasonable service has been brought in. What is the 'reasonable service'? The offerings made through the soul, through the spirit (God, it is said, is Spirit, and those who worship must worship in spirit and truth), things which need no body or instruments or places, such as gentleness, restraint, mercy, endurance of evil, long-suffering, holiness of mind."§ And two centuries earlier St. Irenæus wrote, with perhaps even closer agreement with the Old Testament prophets, "Sacrifices do not sanctify a man, but his conscience who offers, being pure, sanctifies the sacrifice, and makes God accept it as from a friend." It is the life of brotherhood, of human kindness and meekness and forgiveness, which is the true meaning of sacrificial worship.

The doctrine of Christ's eternal heavenly sacrifice, in union with which our eucharists are offered as sacrifices to the Father,

* Burnam Foster, *Christianity in its Modern Expression*, p. 88.

† *The Eucharistic Life*, by Two Members of the Oxford Mission Brotherhood of the Epiphany, p. 43.

‡ Treatise on the Gospel of St. John, cclxxv. § *In Heb.*, Hom. xi., 2, 3.

as well as that of His sacrifice offered on Calvary, must not be stated in such a way as to seem to imply an impossible difference between the Father and the Son, as though the Father were a God of justice and coercion, and the Son a God of love and patience. The Cross of Jesus is the revelation of the secret meaning of the universe, of the ultimate originating principle of the Divine Will. It means that God is Love, and only Love; that Love conquers by giving Itself to the uttermost; that the world lives by His life. It all means sacrifice. Mr. Chesterton has a story of a man who hated the cross, and set out to destroy it wherever he saw it. He battered and broke the altar-cross in church; when he came out the hateful thing greeted him from over the church gate, but he knocked it off; as he started home, he saw the defiant design repeated in every fence, and in the gate of every field, but he broke them all; and when he reached home at last he saw that *everything* (tables and chairs and bedsteads) was built up on this shape of doom. The man who would destroy the cross would destroy civilization, for the world lives and goes forward through self-sacrifice. This is the life of God. Seen against this background the Lord's Supper and the Lord's death are one act, the expression of that eternal self-giving of God by which all things are maintained, the symbol of God's eternal sacrifice. Our sacrament and our life, also, must be one act, in union with, growing out of, that heavenly sacrifice. Catholic Christianity is the vision of the life of God as one eternal self-giving, revealing itself to men to win them to share the glory of its offering.

The inward and spiritual grace of which the sacraments are the outward and visible sign is a profoundly personal and moral gift and relation. It must not be conceived in any quasi-physical or magical fashion, poured into a man as water is poured into a bucket. It is promised to faith, and faith in that sense means not credulity, or easy orthodoxy, but the trust and allegiance that one person gives to another; a faith which is reasonable because it is based on experience interpreted by conscience. The Catholic doctrine of sacramental grace implies (though individual Catholics often forget it, to their own sad loss, and to the weakening of the Church of Christ) the Incarnation *as it actually occurred:* it springs from that revelation of the Father in which the Eternal Son invites men to share the opportunities and the obligation of His own sonship; it means that the Father recognizes the freedom and ideals of His children, and offers them, through the Church and in the sacraments, such help as they need if they are to become His free sons, and such privileges as they can only appropriate so far as they live as children of the light.

The view of the Eucharist so baldly outlined in these articles is that it is the expression and confirmation of the divinity of the material universe, of the glory of the common life, and of the reality of Christian fellowship in Christ. All false spirituality is condemned and made impossible by eucharistic religion; the beauty of nature, the beauty of art, the researches of science into natural truth, the life of the body, and all its functions and pleasures, are claimed, not only as natural, but as divine. The labour by which man wrests from nature his food and clothing is holy for ever because common food and drink have been made the sacraments of Love. The timidity and selfishness which would save men's souls while their bodies are ill-housed, ill-clothed, ill-fed, and dirty, are challenged and condemned by the Christ who showed the external and material as inseparably united to the spiritual. And they who, feeding on the Body of Christ, are sustained and strengthened, being themselves members of His Body the Church, are held in a unity deeper and more real than mere agreement in opinions or sentiments. As the Bread consecrated to be His Body was made from many grains, and the Wine consecrated to be His Blood was made from many grapes, so Christians, being many, are one Body, one Bread, in Christ. And that fellowship, sacramental and divine, must be a fellowship, not primarily of privilege, but of service, a fellowship of mutual help, and of common service of the world, and that not specially in religious things, but in all things. For the distinction between secular and sacred was abolished by Him who blessed common Bread and said, "This is My Body."

Because the Eucharist is the crown and climax of worship, the expression of what Christ meant life to be, the mystery of that sacrificial fellowship which is what is eternal in the Christian Church, there is danger that it may be emptied of all that is most personal and moral in spiritual religion, if it is made the *whole* of religion, in an unreal opposition to the training of reason and conscience, and in a false isolation from the duties and providences of the common life. It is not right to think of the Eucharist as a part of religion or as the whole of religion, or of religion as a part of life or as the whole of life. Religion is the sanction and inspiration and climax of life, and the crown and justification and unifying ideal of such a religion is to be found in the Holy Eucharist.*

A. E. Baker.

* I should think it a doubtful compliment to be told that my treatment of the theology of the Eucharist is new ; it would be unfitting, therefore, for me to attempt to indicate the sources of my ideas. But I must acknowledge the debt which, with all students of the subject, I owe to three living writers : Bishop Gore, Dr. Darwell Stone, and Dr. L. Waterman.

THE GENERAL SYNOD OF AUSTRALIA

The General Synod of the Church of England in Australia and Tasmania met in Sydney on October 4, 1921, for its quinquennial session under somewhat unusual circumstances. No Determinations of General Synod come into force until they have been subsequently accepted by at least two-thirds of the dioceses. The method is cumbrous, but has, on the whole, worked well. In 1916 the General Synod, on the motion of the then Archbishop of Melbourne, decided, in order to do justice to the larger dioceses, to amend the constitution by altering the basis of representation, to increase the number of representatives allowed to certain dioceses and diminish that of others. The proposed changes were fair and just in themselves, and there was a practically unanimous approval of them. Unfortunately, however, it was decided, in order to avoid a five years' delay, not to proceed as usual by Determination, involving a reference to the dioceses, but by a simple rule taking immediate effect. Certain members protested against such a precedent being established on the ground that in the future a similar resolution involving grave injustice to the smaller dioceses might at any time be passed in a small house without notice at the end of Synod; but so great was the impetuosity with which the measure was pressed that a motion proposed by the writer that constitutional lawyers should be asked for their advice before the rule was passed did not even receive a seconder. Subsequent inquiry amply justified the objectors, for practically every lawyer consulted gave it as his opinion that the Synod had acted *ultra vires*, and that the rules were not valid. In the meantime some of the dioceses concerned had elected representatives upon the new, and others upon the old, basis. The very existence of the present Synod was thus threatened, but fortunately common sense prevailed, and a mutual concordat was made that no diocese would question the representation of any other diocese on the condition that the rules were repealed and a Determination passed in the ordinary way to the same effect. The concordat was loyally observed, and the future thus properly safeguarded, while the question of validity was not raised.

The main question before the Synod and its first business after this question had been settled was the presentation of the Report of the Autonomy Committee and the moving of a Determination based upon the Majority Report. The Report which had engaged the attention of the Committee for five years of hard work declared that the existing legal position of the Church in Australia and its relation to the branch in England was unsatisfactory, and it put forth a Determination

to provide "for the extension of the powers of management and government of the Church in Australia and Tasmania." The Determination provided for a common appeal by the dioceses to their State Parliaments to allow the whole Church in Australia to alter if necessary its name and formularies without losing its property—in a word, to be put in the same position as the Anglican Church in every other part of the world except Australia, where by our own acts in the past we have so tied ourselves up that the lawyers all declare that we are not merely a branch of the Church of England in England, but that we *are* the Church of England in England, and that we are bound by every English law, court, and precedent that is in any way capable of application, and that if we differ in the slightest degree from any English law, in the framing of which we have had no voice, or the decision of any English Church court, before which we have no right to plead, we stand to lose all our property. In addition our legal nexus makes it, of course, impossible for us to obey the Lambeth injunctions to try to achieve Reunion, since no other religious community would dream of submitting itself to the legal disabilities in which we are entangled. A Minority Report signed by five members was also presented, stating that in their opinion the proposed safeguards were insufficient.

The second reading of the Determination was moved in a most powerful and convincing speech of over two hours in length by the Bishop of Bathurst, and briefly but ably seconded by a layman. It was immediately and vehemently opposed by the Sydney representatives, who, as they were frankly told by the Archbishop of Brisbane, are mortally afraid lest if the Church in Australia were freed from the legal nexus it might tend to favour a less Protestant Churchmanship than that which has always prevailed in Sydney. With the help of a few speakers from other dioceses they persisted in violent opposition for two days, while little was said by those who were in favour of the Determination, as they were anxious at the loss of time in view of the vast amount of other business before the House. The dramatic close came at the end of the third day, when the Archbishop of Brisbane rose eleven minutes before the hour of adjournment and in a brief speech of irresistible force appealed for a settlement of the question. The opposition were unwise enough to demand a vote by orders, and the result was absolutely decisive of the opinion of the Australian Church as a whole:

Bishops,	for	20;	against	0.
Clergy	,,	55	,,	19.
Laity	,,	48	,,	13.

Of the minority about one-half came from the diocese of Sydney. The advocates of the Determination were magnanimous in victory. Instead of going into Committee and forcing the Determination through, they agreed to be content with the second reading, and to refer the Report and Determination to the dioceses for consideration and approval or suggested amendment. The final Resolution, agreed to by the minority and passed with little difficulty, begins: "Whereas . . . the principle of autonomy has been endorsed by a decisive majority of General Synod." It enacts that the Report and draft Determination shall be remitted to the dioceses, who are to send in their opinions to a Central Committee of Synod by July 1, 1923, together with drafts of the legal enactments they recommend for submission to their Legislatures. These are to be sent in by January 1, 1924. The Central Committee, after receiving these suggestions, will correlate and codify the proposals and submit a uniform document, expressing as nearly as possible the common mind, by September 1, 1924, for their assent, and the proposals are to be submitted to a General Conference of the Church or to General Synod, or to both, in October, 1926. If these approve application will forthwith be made to the Parliaments.

All this means that the idea of proceeding by purely legislative and purely legal methods has been given up in favour of proceeding by conference and mutual agreement. The decision is very wise, as procedure by Determination only opens the door to interminable delays and obstructions. It now resolves itself simply into an attempt to convert the public opinion of the Church. The task will be a difficult one, as the advocates of reform have to meet a solid mass of prejudice and ignorant misunderstanding which will be hard to overcome. It is noteworthy that there is now a tendency on the part of the opponents of autonomy to shift their ground and say, "We do not object, provided you give us ample safeguards for the minority," but the safeguards asked for are so tremendous that they would paralyze all action.

The next big question dealt with was that of Reunion. The Synod gave its approval to the Lambeth Appeal, in regard to which there was a happy unanimity. On the motion of the Bishop of Willochra a Committee of ten Bishops, ten priests, and ten laymen was appointed: (1) To confer with the heads of other Churches; (2) to promote Provincial and Diocesan Committees in connection with itself; (3) to submit definite proposals to the next General Synod. The Committee has met and arranged to invite two representatives each of the Presbyterian Methodists and Congregationalists to meet two of its

representatives on December 6 to arrange for a Conference to be held early in next year.

The Lambeth Resolution on the position of women in the councils of the Church was adopted, but the rest of the Resolutions on this subject, especially 52 (*d*) and 53, were a good deal challenged, and were ultimately referred to the dioceses without recommendation.

Some slight alterations were made in the Board of Missions Determination, but all in matters of detail. The main principles were not challenged, and it was stated that the Church Missionary Society were quite satisfied with the Determination, and did not desire any change. The income of the Board has nearly doubled since the passing of the Determination five years ago, and its efficiency of working largely increased.

The World Conference on Faith and Order Commission was reappointed, and the Bishop of Willochra elected as delegate to the Conference when it meets.

The Lambeth Resolutions on the League of Nations and social questions were unanimously approved, and a Committee appointed to deal with the question of Spiritual Healing and the visit of Mr. Hickson to Australia in 1923.

The Synod authorized the publication of a new edition of the Bishops' pamphlet on *Helps to Parents in Explaining Matters of Sex to the Young*, of which 23,000 copies have been sold.

A Standing Committee of Synod was formed, which will have a heavy responsibility during the next five years, and it is noteworthy that all the prominent Sydney representatives failed to secure election. On the whole, and with the exception of the needless prolongation by the opposition of the debate on autonomy, the level of Synod was high and the work expeditiously performed. The Primate displayed on many occasions real ability as a chairman, and often differed markedly from his diocesan representatives in his wider outlook. Synod expressed its deep sense of loss in the departure of the Archbishop of Brisbane, and welcomed his successor very warmly. The Synod was preceded by a week of Bishops' meetings. They were entirely occupied with matters of their own proper business, and are not, as sometimes imagined, a kind of caucus for General Synod, which was hardly even referred to. The unanimity of the Bishops on autonomy was as unexpected as it was gratifying.

The next five years will be critical in the history of the Australian Church, but she is blessed with real leaders both among the Bishops and the clergy, in addition to not a few of the laity, and can look forward, if not without anxiety, yet with real hope to the future.

GILBERT WILLOCHRA.

ITALY—1921

The "Old Roman Question"—The Popular Party—External Problems—Echoes from Ireland—Church and State in Middle Europe—Palestine—Losses and Gains—Papini's "History of Christ."

The "Old Roman Question"

Matters of far-reaching import have engaged the attention of Church and State in Italy during the year which has just expired: some satisfactorily composed, others, unfortunately, remaining still unsolved and casting their shadow over the new year. Vexed and difficult problems which for more than two generations have defied the statecraft of Italy's keenest politicians and deepest thinkers have entered upon a new phase, the fruitful phase of public discussion. Tentatively broached by the *Messaggero* at the end of May, the suggested abrogation of the "Law of Guarantees" has occupied the attention of Italy, and that Catholic world outside Italy which has never forgiven her the forcible conversion of Rome the reliquary into Rome the capital of a modern, newly made, secular State. The return of France and the adhesion of Portugal to the Papal fold, the establishment of direct diplomatic relations with Holland, and the increased importance of Belgium's representation at the Vatican, to say nothing of the projected diplomatic relations with the United States, have quickened the movement towards an adjustment of the differences which separate the Italian nation and the Holy See. These important developments have stimulated in Vatican circles aspirations for the return of something approximating to the days of Pio Nono—even the cry "Viva il Papa-Re" has been heard—and the matter, as stated, has been debated in the Italian Press, where considerable heartburnings were occasioned by the reconciliation of France with the Holy See. The *Osservatore Romano* of September 2 last availed itself of the opportunity to publish an important article on the subject over the signature of the Controlling Director, Count Della Torre, in which the attitude of the Holy See is defined in vigorous and unequivocal words: that in yielding to *force majeure* in 1870 the Holy See has never acknowledged, and can never acknowledge, the justice of that "act of violence"—in short, that its freedom and independence can only be secured by certain territorial adjustments, as yet unspecified, on the part of Italy. "And Italy, in acknowledging territorial modifications which the Holy See might perchance (*per avventura*) consider sufficient would not be renouncing in any way a legitimate possession, but would render legitimate her posses-

sion of the rest "(!). At this point of the discussion the *Stampa*, the Liberal-democratic organ of Turin, has sounded the alarm of danger to the Italian State, and asserts that the Vatican has laid its plans: it has everything to gain by a reconciliation with Italy, or at least as much to gain as Italy has to lose if she relinquishes the least scrap of her territorial rights.

The Popular Party.

And there are other considerations. Is Italy free to reject or adopt a policy of concession in view of the growing responsibility of the "Partito Popolare" in the legislature of the country? At the recent elections the party increased its representation in the Chamber from 100 to 106; it has furnished the Government with 3 Ministers and 5 Under-Secretaries; it has gained in solidity by shedding its more extreme elements, and is undoubtedly a force to be reckoned with. The Holy See refers to the "Partito Popolare" as a non-confessional, political organization, and therefore outside its jurisdiction; but will not the increasing strength of this party ("not a Catholic party, but a political party which Catholics would join") enable the Vatican, in due season, effectually to prosecute its own policy? In this connection it will be interesting to observe the party's influence, not only on the Roman Question, but also on the subject of divorce, when this vexed question is again on the tapis.

External Problems.

Outstanding problems which perhaps most deeply concern the Holy See outside Italy are centred in Austria and Poland. At the close of 1920 the faithful had collected and handed to the Holy Father 15,292,461 lire for suffering children in Central Europe, which fund has been expended principally in mitigating the distress in Austria. The fight of Poland against the Bolsheviks is the fight of Catholicism, of the Holy See itself, against the forces of unbelief, of disintegration. In the days of most agonizing fear, when the new-born State's very existence was in danger, Benedict XV. wrote to his Vicar, Cardinal Pompili, inviting all the Bishops of the world to call for public prayers on behalf of Poland, to the end that Heaven might not only spare the people of Poland, but likewise ward off this new calamity from impoverished and exhausted Europe: a passionate appeal which aroused some amount of opposition in view of the discriminating attitude adopted by the Vatican towards the Irish "rebellion."

Echoes from Ireland

It was considered " neither useful nor necessary " to intervene in the dispute between England and Ireland, although at intervals the Holy Father deplored acts of violence on either side. Some of the faithful, however, have failed to appreciate the Papal preference for Poland over Ireland, and have queried why they should pray for the one country and not for the other. Eventually, they indulged their exasperated feelings at a tumultuous Irish meeting in Rome, under the auspices of the Association of Catholic University students. The assembly was evidently dominated by the " Partito Popolare," for sentiments of extreme bitterness were voiced by Dr. Borromeo, Signor Mauri, and Signor Martire, all of the Popular Party, besides Mr. Gavan Duffy, the last-named being described as deputy of the Irish Republican Parliament and Official Representative of the Irish Republic.

Church and State in Middle Europe.

The dissensions which had arisen, and which threatened to disrupt the Church in Czecho-Slovakia a year ago, have since come to a head, resulting in the secession of some sixty priests, together with a very large following, to the Yugo-Slav National Church, under the ægis of the State. Among the chief points at issue are the celibacy of the priesthood and the use of the vernacular in the liturgy; matters on which the Church is adamant. His Holiness has expressed the desire that no friction should arise between the Church in Czecho-Slovakia and the Government, a prayer which all will endorse. Trying and difficult times, however, confront the faithful, a considerable body both in numbers and importance, for the matter has not only its ecclesiastical but also its political bearings.

Palestine.

Moreover, national rivalries are playing their part and are fomenting trouble in the Holy Land. The Pope has deplored the policy of the British Government in regard to the Zionist movement, which, he asserts, is to the detriment of the Catholic population. He has protested further against the desecration of Holy Places by the introduction of cinemas and dancing-halls in Jerusalem itself, and has rejoiced that at least the proposal to convert Mount Carmel into a pleasure resort has been frustrated. This view, we are convinced, will be shared by the whole Christian world.

It might be inferred from the above survey that present-day Christianity in Italy is but a political pawn in the game of national and international diplomacy, a cloak to mask ambitions, and the rallying-ground of tottering Governments which are too weak to repress the forward movement of young and rising peoples. And yet there are shafts of light, revelations of deeply religious consciousness amongst individuals striving after a greater spirituality, and a harbour of safety wherein the storm-tossed ship of the soul may find a sure refuge and anchorage. Spiritism may mock Orthodoxy by practising its rites within the very gates of Catholic Rome—séances are known to have been held at the Y.M.C.A. headquarters established there by the English during the war, but now entirely in Italian hands—but its votaries rub shoulders with deep thinkers, writers, and workers who are all earnest seekers after truth.

Losses and Gains.

It is to be deplored that towering figures of faith and integrity have vanished from our midst—Cardinal Ferrari, the beloved Archbishop of Milan; Cardinal Camassei, who suffered such hardships at the hands of the Turks; Lino Ferriani, the indefatigable and loving worker in the cause of the infantile delinquent, and many others; but there remains a goodly spiritual fellowship, living and striving, erring and retrieving. Of such is Don Ernesto Bonaiutti, a well-known and deeply revered priest, who endured a painful period of doubt and despair before incurring excommunication and suspension *a divinis*, and who for months groped in darkness before he relinquished the struggle, made his submission, and was received back into the Church and reinstated.

Papini's "History of Christ."

But the great event of the year in the field of spiritual development and conversion has been the return to the faith, after years of bitter scepticism, of the much-discussed author, Giovanni Papini. He has come to the full perception of Christian truth and the unequivocal acceptance of Catholic dogma, the remarkable fact being that he takes up his stand without dogmatizing and without adding one iota to religious controversy: he is simply and unaffectedly Orthodox. Such, at least, is the humble estimate of the layman. It remains to be seen whether his standard of faith and dogma in his *History of Christ* will pass the scrutiny of the theologian, or whether his work will be placed on the Index. Ecclesiastical criticism, so far, has been vague and guarded, whereas the lay press has

freely and extensively expressed its opinion, both favourable and the reverse.

Papini's personality, as well as his previous writings, had procured for him many enemies, who, on this occasion, failed to perceive that the violence with which they attacked this new work did more to popularize it than did the eulogies of his admiring friends or the reticence of official Catholicism. His most relentless critic refuses to admit any value whatsoever in the book, asserting that in it Christ is martyred and crucified anew. "It is not history, nor exegesis, nor phantasy: it is a waste of time." More constructive criticism recognizes its high artistic, literary, and linguistic value, but exposes, among other defects, the paradoxical attitude of the author, who inveighs with such evident exaggeration and disregard of actualities against mammon, bankers, and speculators in general, all of whom he identifies with Cain and brands with the curse of Judas. Another accusation is his sweeping condemnation of Socrates, Horace, and "all worthy pagans," nor does Papini's limited knowledge of Oriental lore escape the dissecting knife of his remorseless judges.

As might be expected, both Socialists and Communists claim Papini as one of theirs. The *Avanti* queries, however, the congruity of presenting the left cheek after the right has been smitten, but takes refuge in the saving clause that neither the Gospel nor Papini has defined what should follow afterwards. *Christian Democracy*, again, would fain take Papini out of his orthodox stronghold and register him in a special little index of its own. The salient fact remains, however, that the *History of Christ* is a singularly strong, original, and beautiful work which defies classification, and towers isolated in the spiritual desert of our age. In the opinion of the Man in the Street, "it is well worth reading," and the opinion of the Man in the Street is generally well worth considering.

M. Cimino-King.

THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST: A SUGGESTION

There is no book of Holy Scripture which lends itself to such diverse interpretation, or which has provoked such acrimonious controversy thereby, as the Apocalypse. Bristling as it does with disputable symbols and debatable sayings, the most notorious of all is the statement of chapter xiii. 18. Its introduction by a double reminder of the one necessity (viz., "wisdom" or "understanding") for its comprehension

is so remarkable that it would seem as if the Seer himself felt strongly the difficulty which its interpretation would afford. The Revised Version renders it thus: "Here is wisdom. He that hath understanding, let him count the number of the beast; for it is the number of a man: and his number is Six hundred and sixty and six," words which, to quote a great writer, "have been so great a puzzle to the Church of Christ in all ages of her history." Even the re-examination of such a passage may seem to some almost an impertinence; yet the process may not be devoid of interest to others, or even, it may be, of profit.

The difficulty of the interpretation of this saying, great enough in itself, is enhanced by two subsidiary uncertainties. The first is the question: To which of the Two Enemies, already described in this chapter, does the statement refer? Grammatically, it may quite well refer to the Second Enemy, and some understand this as being the Seer's meaning. A careful examination, however, points to the opposite conclusion. It is true that, in recording the advent of the Second Enemy of chapter xiii., St. John does describe him as "another beast" (verse 11), but the term is obviously rendered necessary by the following symbolic description of him as combining the features of the lamb and the characteristics of the dragon. Except, however, for this one occasion, it seems certain that the term is never applied to him again. In the following verse, where he has occasion to use the term twice, St. John carefully writes "the *first* beast," so as to avoid any possible confusion with the Second Enemy, and two verses on again very carefully describes "the beast" to whom he refers, in language which admits of no mistake, by re-quoting his previous description of the First Enemy from verse 3. He then proceeds to use the term by itself twice more (in verse 15), where mistake is impossible because of the connection with the preceding sentences. By this time it would seem certain that the identity of "the beast" was so fully established in the reader's mind that no further guarding terms were needed, so that henceforth—in verses 17 and 18, and throughout the rest of the book—the First Enemy is unvaryingly described as "*the* beast." The fact is that the real title of the Second Enemy is not "beast" at all, but "false prophet," always used of him in the only other passages where a further reference to him is made (xvi. 13, xix. 20, and xx. 10), and where the three titles of the Three Enemies are perfectly clear. This would seem to make it certain that, except for the symbolism of the description of his appearance in xiii. 11, the term "beast" would never have

been used of the false prophet, since it is the term reserved for the First Enemy. It is, therefore, only confusing to refer to "The First Beast" and "The Second Beast," since, in the view of the Apocalypse, there is but *one:* there are two "Enemies" in chapter xiii., but only the First is "the beast"; the other is "the false prophet." We may feel sure, then, that the reference of the mysterious statement of verse 18 is to the First Enemy, and not to the Second.

The second uncertainty is due to the appearance in some manuscripts of a different reading of the number, giving 616 instead of 666. The authority, however, of this alternative reading is not very great, and its probability infinitely less, so that we are safe in assuming "Six hundred and sixty and six" to be the number given by St. John.

The interpreters of this mysterious saying may, for convenience, be divided into two main classes: (1) Those who fix their attention on the *Name* of the Beast; and (2) those who consider his *Number* to be the important point. The views of each class are supported by well-known and competent scholars, and both call for careful consideration.

The first class of interpreters base their interpretation on the fact that in Greek, as in Hebrew, the letters of the alphabet have a numerical value. The "number of the name," therefore, it is said, must mean that the letters of the actual name of the Beast, when their numerical values are added together, produce a total which the Apostle declares to be "666," and the solution of the problem lies in thus ascertaining the name which he had in mind. The majority of these interpreters understand the meaning of "the number of a man" to be, as Weymouth paraphrases it, "for it indicates a certain man," and therefore the problem comes to be the discovery of some particular person the letters of whose name have the numerical value of 666, and whose history is such as to make the description of the Beast applicable to him. As might be expected, the number of probable or possible guesses that can be made in this direction is almost limitless. The outstanding solution thus arrived at, however, and that with perhaps the greatest amount of support, is the one which sees here the identification of the Beast with the Emperor Nero. It would be impossible, within the limits of this article, to discuss even this one solution of the problem; it must suffice to say that its great weakness lies in the fact that, in order to produce the total of 666, "Nero Cæsar" must be put into Hebrew letters, and even then a spelling of "Cæsar" must be adopted which competent scholars pronounce to have been impossible in the first century.

The advocates of the various solutions proposed in this line of interpretation may be divided into those who see here the description of some person who lived in the age of St. John, those who have made it apply to personages of later centuries, and those who believe that the individual thus described has not yet appeared, but will do so before, or at the time of, the end. Ingenious, however, as many of these solutions are, it would yet seem evident that none of them can possibly square with other references to the Beast which are found in the Apocalypse. In chapter xix., for example, we are shown the Beast as playing his part in the great and final conflict between Christ and His enemies, which appears necessarily to exclude any historical personage up to the present time, nor can one suppose that even Nero, monster of wickedness as he was, could be set forth as linked with the Devil in that trio of the foes of Christ whose final doom is so terribly depicted in chapter xx., verse 10. Still more decisive is the fact that the description of any one individual, however remarkable his personality, is contrary to the whole tenor of the Apocalypse, as clearly shown by Professor Milligan and others. If their views are correct, the principles of the book would be violated by the selection of any particular man, or indeed of any particular age, for delineation. In their view the book represents the great spiritual principles at work throughout the whole history of the Church, and thus its message is for every age and not alone for one. Obviously, then, if Nero, or some contemporary of his, be indicated, the whole message concerning the Beast, however useful for St. John's age, would have no practical concern for us, just as the representation of a person yet to appear would have no real interest for the Church up to the present time. But if, as many believe, the book must have its message for all ages of the Church, that reason alone would compel us to dismiss all names of persons as unsatisfactory.

There are still other interpreters of the class we are considering, who understand the phrase "the number of a man" to mean "according to human reckoning" (*i.e.*, with letters of numerical value), and who see in the number 666 other names than those of individual men. Of these the most famous is probably that which Alford—although with great hesitancy—adopts and which reads here the word "Lateinos," thus said to represent Rome, both Pagan and Papal, both Imperial and Ecclesiastical. To those who see in the Apocalypse chronological disclosures of history, this interpretation must be more satisfactory than that which discovers the name of a person, but the view of the whole book, as given above,

will still prevent many from entertaining this solution, as the objection therein indicated will equally well apply.

Then we turn to the second and much smaller class of interpreters, who have seen that the key to the puzzle does not lie in the *name* but in the *number* of the Beast. They have fully appreciated the fact that in the Apocalypse the numbers used are just as truly symbols as are the other figures employed, such as "stars," "trees," "mountains," etc., which are universally recognized to be such. Thus 7 is the number which always represents that which is infinite, or perfect, or complete, and which is so sacred from its constant connection with the Divine perfections, while $3\frac{1}{2}$—the 7 broken in twain—represents just the opposite—viz., that which is finite or imperfect or incomplete; so that, for instance, as Dean Vaughan points out, 7 is often, in this book, "the emblem of the duration of the glory that shall be," and $3\frac{1}{2}$ the symbol "of the duration of the conflicts and tribulations of the present." Hence they interpret 666 as indicating the fact that the Beast, subtle and powerful as he may be, is always and will be always inferior to the Divine, just as 6, whether it stand by itself or be multiplied by 10 or by 100 (as in 666), must, as 6, ever be below the number 7. So Hengstenberg writes: "The 666 is, as it were, the swollen, blown-up 6—the 6 in its highest potency—but still, even when swelled up and increased to the uttermost, no more than the 6." Here (*pace* the historicist!) many will believe that we are on much surer ground. But this solution, standing alone, scarcely seems to account for the words "the number of a man," which must then be taken simply as equivalent to some such general phrase as "a human number," or "a number known to common reckoning," which certainly seems a very redundant statement, since what other number could be used? Beside which, it is very unlike St. John, who never uses a word unnecessarily.

In face of the fact that this great puzzle of the Apocalypse has occupied the attention of countless scholars in all ages of the Church, and that no really satisfactory answer—at any rate, none that commands anything like a general acceptance—has yet been found, it would, indeed, be impertinent to put forward a solution as being a final discovery. The following thoughts, therefore, must not be considered as more than tentative and suggestive.

In the first place, the assumption by so many interpreters that the "name" of the Beast has the meaning of a literal title is more than improbable. Again and again in Holy Scripture, as every student knows, "the name" is used as being equivalent to "the character" or "the attributes." In

Isa. ix. 6, for instance, the list of titles given were never actually borne by our Lord, but they do express His attributes. In the Apocalypse this use of "name" is frequent enough, as in such passages as iii. 12, xiv. 1, xvii. 5, xix. 13, 16, and xxii. 4, where this sense of the word is perfectly clear. The use even of a definite title, merely as a spiritual symbol of character, is found in xi. 8, where the names given to "the great city" are literally impossible, but which accurately represent its character (see also viii. 11, ix. 11). This is surely, then, the meaning of the "name" of the Beast.

This meaning is confirmed by the words of xv. 2. In no possible sense could the victors by the glassy sea be said to "come victorious" from a literal name, expressed by the numerical value of letters of the alphabet; such a statement would be meaningless. But that they "come victorious" from that character which was sought to be impressed upon them is easy to understand.

This throws light also upon the two "marks" of the Beast in verse 17. The difference there would appear to be that in the one case the character ("the name") was imprinted, clear and distinct, for all to see; in the other, while it was still imprinted, it was to some extent concealed under the symbol of a "number." The same double imprint, one plainly visible and one partially concealed, is indicated in verse 16 by the "forehead" and the "right hand."

Then, in the next place, it is not a little curious that scarcely any interpreter seems to have noted the care with which St. John refrains from saying that 666 is "the number of the *name* of the Beast," as he might well be expected to do, and as apparently nearly everybody supposes that he does! As he had just mentioned that number of the name in the previous sentence, it is surely highly significant that he should *not* now repeat the phrase, but write instead "the number of the Beast." Remembering the minute care which marks the choice of every expression in the Apocalypse, it would seem that there must be some definite reason for this change in phraseology. May not that reason be that the "number of the name" and "the number of the Beast" are not, as always assumed, identical, but that there are in St. John's mind *two* numbers, perfectly distinct from each other, the one symbolizing the name of the Beast, the other symbolizing the Beast himself—the actual figures of the one not being given (since it is only the concealed form of the name, or character, of the Beast), but the other, because of the importance of its teaching concerning the Beast himself, being definitely stated as 666? Then the reason for that change of phrase becomes perfectly clear—viz., to prevent

the confusion of two symbolic numbers, one unstated and one stated.

In the third place, what is the true rendering of ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἐστί? The Authorized Version, the Revised Version, and the American Version alike translate—"for it is the number of a man." But must the anarthrous ἄνθρωπος in Greek necessarily have an article in English? May not the sense here be generic as is that of the anarthrous ἄνθρωπος in many passages of the Septuagint?—*e.g.*, 2 Chron. xiv. 11: μὴ κατισχυσάτω πρός σε ἄνθρωπος—Let not man prevail against Thee. Ps. viii. 4: Τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι μιμνήσκῃ αὐτοῦ;—What is man that Thou art mindful of him? Ps. cii. 15: Ἄνθρωπος, ὡσεὶ χόρτος αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ—Man, his days are as grass. Why, then, should we not translate in the same way here, so that the rendering would be, "For it is the number of man"? In xxi. 17 we have a somewhat similar sentence; the Revised Version renders "According to the measure of a man, that is, of an angel"; but does not the anarthrous noun give a better sense here also?—"According to the measure of man, that is [because the cubit was originally the length of the human forearm], of angel"—"angel" being anarthrous also, as in Acts xxiii. 8.

How does this affect the whole view of the Beast? Obviously it sweeps away entirely all possible reference to an individual or to any historical fact. But the interpretation which sees in the Beast the World-power as opposed to Christ (*i.e.*, the world of ungodly men) is immensely strengthened thereby, for then we have St. John's plain declaration that the Beast *is* Man (*i.e.*, Humanity), as looked at apart from God, unregenerate, evil, inimical to Him and to His Church, which corresponds to the undoubted teaching of other parts of the Apocalypse (ix. 20, 21, xvi. 21).

But if there be here such a plain statement as this of the meaning of the symbol, wherein lies the wisdom and the understanding which is so strongly emphasized? It must lie, in that case, not in the identification of the Beast (thus plainly declared), but in the application to him of the number 666. Here the minority of interpreters, already alluded to, are on the right track; unregenerate humanity is not only always "against God," but it ever falls short of the sacred 7 of the Divine power and glory; it can never—try as it may—be more than the lesser 6, and therefore, in its conflict with God, its final defeat and overthrow are certain from the beginning. Not only so, but as in this book the number 12 is symbolical of the Church (that is, of man reconciled to God and made one with Him by faith in Jesus Christ), so is this figure 6—

the broken 12—the symbol of that part of mankind outside the Holy Church, and still separated from God by sin. Ever against that Church is vented the hatred and pitted the strength of the Beast, the ungodly world, and here again does the fatal and inferior 6 ever declare the same truth of the certainty of the Church's victory over the Beast at last.

So read, the Number of the Beast holds its message for every age, from first to last, of the Church's history. Nero, although the number be not his as an individual, is yet included here, with all that savage power of persecuting Pagan Rome which wrought its worst upon the Early Church, and yet failed to conquer. In far-away Japan, at the extermination of Christianity nearly 300 years ago, and in Madagascar, Uganda, and China by the persecutions and martyrdoms of the last century, the same Beast fought against the Church in those lands, and again failed eventually to overcome her, despite his slaughter of the confessors of Christ. Nor in our own day can we fail to identify the same Beast, if we have read the vision aright, and if he represent Man—Man without God in the world, yet himself the object of his own worship (verse 12). Could any clearer delineation be given, for instance, of the recent outbreak of the German power, with its deliberate flinging aside of Christ and all His teaching, and its arrogant "Might is Right"? Or can we not equally well trace here the awful terror of Bolshevism, ruling as it does with no regard for God or His laws, but simply in its own wisdom and power? Or, to come nearer home, is there not portrayed here beyond mistake the very spirit of the masses of our own people to-day, with their cry, "Vox Populi, Vox Dei"? How significant—and how true a translation of the character of the Beast into ordinary English—are the words of an article which appeared recently in *The Yorkshire Post* on "Labour and Religion." The writer says:

"A great proletariat, perhaps more intelligent than the world has ever seen, is emerging from the shadows of ignorance and darkness to claim its share in the vivid life of the world. The pageant of heaven it has never seen, neither did its fathers see it. It knows not the Gods, and despises their ministers, human and immaterial. Its high priests are town-planners, who raise desirable mansions for the body; of the many mansions of the soul it is ignorant or incurious. . . . Man himself is their God, because God is He who can, and will, help man in his thousandfold struggle of life. They will raise no stately fanes to the Unseen and the Unknown, but will build practical altars for the mind and body of men. Their Kingdom of Heaven is on earth, and no vague Eternal City gleams before their senses."

Such is the picture of to-day, and who will say that it is not true to life? More and more men are becoming divorced from God, more plainly and clearly there become defined the lineaments of the Beast, more and more threatening grows his aspect as the years roll on. Is there not comfort for us, who still hold fast to the Eternal, to find in this Vision of the Apocalypse no mere intellectual puzzle applicable only to some other age, but to trace here the very prophecy of our own time as well as of times gone by? And surely there is greater comfort still for God's people in that mysterious number, displaying in its threefold aggregation the world's pride of power, and yet exhibiting also its inherent weakness, together with the self-contained assurance of that world's final subjugation in the Day of God which is yet to be, the Day when

The great Church victorious
Shall be the Church at rest.

W. J. L. Sheppard.

[The above article was written before reading that of Dr. Beet on the same subject in *The Expositor*. It may be of interest to note the similarity in some respects between the suggested lines of interpretation, although with a considerable difference in application, largely due to Dr. Beet's assumption that the mysterious number is that of the Second Enemy.—W.J.L.S.]

DR. RASHDALL'S THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT

(A Criticism by an Objectivist.)

Dr. Rashdall's teaching on the Atonement compels those who hold simple Evangelical views as well as Objectivists to reconsider their position. No one can study it without feeling that it is the product, not only of a scholar dealing with questions of grammar, exegesis, and historical accuracy, but also of a convinced Christian pleading for the faith which is in him. It contains more than scholarship, and it will be comforting to many to reflect that what they feel to be a smaller Gospel than their own has yet such power to win and retain. Nor can one help feeling the force of the simplicity of teaching which urges that God requires nothing more than genuine repentance in order to make forgiveness possible.

One is also impressed with the sincerity of the writer in making truth, as he sees it, his primary object—*e.g.*, as early

as p. 4, though his intention is to disprove doctrine which claims to be based on our Lord's teaching, yet he admits that "it should be by no means assumed that a doctrine is not true because it is not found in the teaching of Christ"—a view which he elsewhere repeats (p. 47). Again, in connection with the important "Ransom" passage, after working hard to disprove its validity, he concludes by saying that if anyone holds that there is a slight probability in favour of its genuineness this view cannot be refuted (p. 55).

Yet, in spite of these endearing features, and of its immense learning, the book will, in many cases, fail to carry conviction, because, although its arguments in detail may be felt to be true, the foundations upon which its conclusions logically depend are questionable, and it contains misconceptions and oversights on certain important points.

Dr. Rashdall's theory is that our Lord's death is in no way the ground upon which sins are forgiven (pp. 48-9; 438, etc.), but was in its nature only a supreme act of service which, because it adequately brought home to men the love of God, completed the work of His life, and inspires men with the desire to serve Him. A sincere repentance originating in this manner, and including a life of practical obedience, is all that God needs for the forgiveness of sin. This is the true doctrine of Christ's Atonement and God's plan of salvation.

In order to maintain this theory it is obvious that a modernist position towards textual criticism and theology in general must be taken up by Dr. Rashdall, and, from the nature of his frequent references to the "modern mind," it is clear that he is confident that this is the only foundation upon which Christian doctrine can reasonably be based. The general attitude from which he works out his own doctrine of the Atonement may be described as follows:

1. Our Lord, as recorded in the synoptic Gospels (which supply the only reliable records of His words), did not give any teaching which justifies the objective theory of the Atonement. It was, indeed, opposed to it.

2. Any teaching of this character found in the rest of the New Testament is due to a mistaken interpretation of the prophets (especially of Isa. liii.) by the early Church. The expiatory and vicarious ideas which thus arose were adopted and developed by St. Paul; and his commanding influence to a great extent accounts for their presence in other books of the New Testament. This teaching, however, does not exist to the extent generally supposed, the passages usually quoted in support of it not necessarily containing these ideas.

Examining in detail the arguments by which Dr. Rashdall

arrives at these conclusions, we find (p. 78, etc.) that he holds that Jewish prophecy was the source of the idea that "Christ died for our sins," and that this was due especially to the marvellous manner in which the phrases of Isa. liii. fitted in with the circumstances of His death. He then goes on to assume that because it is now generally accepted that the "Suffering Servant" passages are intended to portray the despised and rejected spiritual Israel within Israel, and in the mind of the prophet were not consciously intended to foretell Messianic events, therefore it is a mistake to regard them as prophetically descriptive of the circumstances of our Lord's life, work, and death.

We have here a vast assumption which is one of the most important foundations upon which the argument of Dr. Rashdall's theory is built up, and it is an assumption we cannot permit to pass unquestioned. Professor Burney in a sermon preached before the University of Oxford has pointed out that in the Old Testament the prophets claimed the power of prediction, that it was made a proof of their Divine commission, and that the truth of their claim is found in the events of history. He has also shown that there are sound reasons for believing that from the beginning, as well as towards the end of His ministry, our Lord taught that the prophetic conception of the Suffering Servant found fulfilment in Himself, and was applied by Himself to Himself immediately after His resurrection when, we may suppose, death had given Him a still clearer insight into the Divine plan for man's salvation.

Professor Burney's published criticism deserves careful study, and we may add to it the consideration that when, on the Mount of Transfiguration (the authenticity of which cannot be lightly set aside simply on the ground that we cannot understand how it could take place), our Lord spoke with Moses and Elijah of the things concerning His approaching death, the presence of Moses was in itself sufficient to suggest a connection between Christ and the Paschal Lamb and the whole system of Judaic sacrifices. Moreover, even before the beginning of our Lord's ministry our Lord had been publicly hailed by St. John the Baptist as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and even though we grant that some of the longer speeches in St. John cannot be counted upon to give us the *ipsissima verba* of the speaker, yet this by no means applies to so short and so striking an utterance as this, which to Jewish ears was full of sacrificial and expiatory significance.

From these and other indications—*e.g.*, references to the Servant of God in the early speeches of Acts—we may venture to assert that when on the road to Emmaus our Lord, "begin-

ning at Moses and all the prophets, interpreted unto [the two disciples] in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself," it is almost certain that He applied the Suffering Servant passages of Isaiah to Himself. If He omitted to do so the disciples, either on this occasion or during the great forty days, would have been sure to question Him on the subject. Using an intelligent historical imagination and visualizing the circumstances of the case, it seems unreasonable to suppose otherwise than that it is practically certain He must have given teaching on this point. And though the significance of prophecy in relation to His Person and mission was little recognized at the time by the nation at large, yet it certainly had a large place, as Professor Burney has shown, in awakening and moulding our Lord's spiritual perceptions and His conception of the place He was to fill in the work of the world's salvation, and we ask whether, when He identified Himself with the "Suffering Servant" of Isaiah, and all the expiatory and substitutionary ideas involved, His interpretation also was mistaken as well as that of the early Church? We shall not be very ready to admit that in this matter He was less capable of interpreting the prophets aright, or was less capable of insight into the spiritual truths they revealed, even without the aid of recent textual critical methods, than the modernists of recent times. For these "Suffering Servant" passages are not by any means on all fours with the famous passage in Psalm cx. round which the κένωσις controversy raged, since their application to our Lord is not affected by historical criticism. Whether the prophet conceived of the "Suffering Servant" as a particular individual, or as a symbol of the nation, does not really affect the validity of our Lord's application of them to Himself. It would be possible for a prophet to have mistaken ideas as to the full significance of a prophecy and yet for it to be a real "fore-telling" in another and larger sphere than he had conceived.

Moreover, on the general question of the value of the doctrinal teaching of prophecy as being divinely inspired, it is not, after all, so much a question of whether there have been prophets in the sense of men who *consciously* foretold the future, as whether there has been prophecy in the "foretelling" sense. Dr. Rashdall argues as though the valid force of prophecy depended upon the prophet being conscious that he was predicting the future. But if, in the history of nations, in the words, writings, or actions of men, or if, above all, in the ritual and mysteries of a nation's religion, God wrote aforetime on the rocks of time prophecies foretelling or throwing light upon the mysteries of His future relations with men and the method of

His plan of salvation—if this be so, that is surely a more important truth for us to recognize than any which might emerge in answer to the question as to whether the men whom He had used were conscious of the full significance of their words and actions.

Moreover, unless we throw over our belief in any inspiration of the Bible at all, and are prepared to deny that it is in any sense God's word, then, from what we have learnt of Divine methods of inspiration, it appears that nothing could be more in harmony with them than that the Levitical law and ritual, and the prophet's figurative methods of portraying personal, local, and national contemporary conditions, should be used and so moulded by God as to form true though unconscious foretellings of future events. In fact the prophet Himself is really always God, and men are only the instruments He uses. Sometimes He uses their words, and sometimes their actions and the incidents of their lives. If words are used we call them prophets; if their actions, or the story of their lives, we call them types, and we have Joseph and Moses as prophetical types of our Lord. He can also use nations, and then we get Israel as a prophecy of the spiritual progress of all humanity. Of such Divine foretellings the deutero-Isaiah's prophecy of the Messiah under the form of the Suffering Servant of God would be an outstanding example. To lay it down that because, or if, the prophet did not intend this application therefore such an interpretation is not correct is to make an unwarranted assumption of restrictions in the methods of Divine Providence. Moreover, if consciousness of foretelling powers is an essential to validity all the prophetic element must be expunged from incidents such as the manna, the smitten rock, the brazen serpent, etc., and from the lives of historical and other figures, such as Moses, Joshua, Joseph, Aaron, Melchisedec, and Jonah.

But the prophetic, preparatory view of Divine operation becomes obligatory if we believe in a personal, rational God working out His plans by evolutionary methods. For in this case the final end must have been preconceived from the beginning, and each step of progress is not one of blind chance, but is a regular development, having its proper place in the ordered whole. And this involves that each such step, when rightly understood, is prophetic of the consummation it helps to bring about, and also of the intervening stages to be passed through on the way. So that, granted that the Jewish people have had some special function to fulfil in God's plan of salvation for humanity, and that Jesus is the Messiah, as Dr. Rashdall believes, in Whom that function attained its complete

development, then it necessarily follows that the outstanding features of religion and history in the life of the Jewish nation were prophetic of God's plan of salvation as it was finally worked out in the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of our Lord. It follows that also there is a force, which Dr. Rashdall will not admit, in the view of the New Testament writers and the Fathers of the Church that "the Scriptures must be fulfilled."

These considerations are of crucial importance to the validity of Dr. Rashdall's theory of the Atonement, because they contravene his assumption that the interpretation placed by the early Church upon the prophets, and especially upon the prophetical figure of the Suffering Servant, as a foretelling of our Lord was a mistaken one. And in so doing they cut away the basis of his case against SS. Paul and John and the other authors of New Testament writings influenced by the latter; so that the validity of all the evidence in favour of the expiatory and substitutionary theory supplied by them is restored; and also the important consequence follows, that that Divine sanction which forms the essence of the evidential value of prophecy is found to be in support of those ideas of substitution, vicarious sacrifice, and expiation which originate in the Old Testament and are worked out in the New. The Holy Spirit Himself, as it were, bears witness in their favour as the Author of prophecy.

There remains in support of Dr. Rashdall's case the teaching of our Lord Himself, and certain considerations of a moral and philosophical character. With regard to the former he claims (p. 29) that there are only two passages—viz., the "ransom" saying and the language used at the institution of the Holy Communion—which in any way teach that forgiveness depends upon Christ's death. He argues that the former saying does not necessarily mean more than that the death of our Lord either literally saved the lives of the disciples, or that it made possible (by its subjective appeal) the setting up of His Messianic kingdom on earth (pp. 31-37). Possibly our Lord's thought was "that His sufferings would be accepted by the Father as the prayers and intercessions of the righteous might be," but "there is nothing to suggest that the particular benefit which His death would win was the forgiveness of sins." In the same way, with the help of textual criticism, and arguments similar to the above, Dr. Rashdall reduces the Words of Institution to comparative insignificance, claiming with regard to the Cup and the New Covenant in Christ's Blood that "there is nothing sacrificial about such a covenant as this; there is no suggestion that the forgiveness promised had anything to do with a sacri-

ficial death, or was dependent on any condition whatever"; and with regard to the Bread that "the most natural interpretation is simply this: "As I give you this Bread, so I devote Myself wholly to you (*to* you rather than *for* you). I desire to identify Myself with you in the closest possible manner: take this as a farewell expression of our spiritual union.' There is no idea of an atonement upon which the forgiveness of sins depends" (p. 43).

Two answers present themselves to this argument:

1. That in dealing with two only of our Lord's sayings and actions Dr. Rashdall has not really covered the field. In the sermon already referred to Dr. Burney has pointed out that there are several occasions on which our Lord identified Himself with the Suffering Servant of the Deutero-Isaiah, including the notable incident of His sermon in the Synagogue at Nazareth in St. Luke iv. In so doing, He also identified Himself with all those ideas of vicarious sacrifice and expiation with which the figure of the Suffering Servant is inextricably involved.

With regard to the statement that no scholarly mind would claim that we have the *ipsissima verba* of the speaker in St. John's Gospel, it is extremely questionable how far this is true. In some cases where a speech consists only of a phrase or a short sentence we may have reasonable confidence that we possess the exact language. In other longer and continuous speeches we must admit that unless miraculously inspired to do so it would be impossible for the writer to reproduce the exact language used. Yet even in these cases we must bear in mind the extraordinary powers of the ancient and Eastern mind in this direction, and at any rate we may believe we have the correct *thought* of our Lord even if we have not His exact words. For:

(1) We have our Lord's promise (St. John xiv. 26) that the Holy Spirit would strengthen the disciples' memories; and these particular instances illustrate the kind of speech of which they would not be likely to forget the substance.

(2) Apart from any special Divine help of this kind, the disciples were for a considerable time in very close touch with our Lord, long enough, at least, to enable them to know His mind and catch the colour of His thoughts and general outlook very exactly. They must have known His mental attitude upon the matters they spoke and wrote about. No doubt, they would be conscious that there were heights and deeps where they were unable to follow, but they would also know what they knew correctly, and they would not set forth as His views statements which they knew were incorrect in substance. On these grounds there is good reason for questioning whether their

understanding of our Lord's teaching and their presentment of it is not really nearer the truth than the views of theologians whose interpretations are inevitably coloured by personal preference and doctrinal bias. For this reason, even though it may be true that we cannot go to St. John's Gospel for " the *ipsissima verba* of the Master uncoloured by the later reflections of the disciples, the Church, and the Evangelist himself " (p. 28), it still remains doubtful whether any such colouring amounts to a misrepresentation, and it may be sound textual criticism to hold that the teaching of that Gospel presents the Master's mind more correctly than the interpretations of modern critics. That is to say, it is really more lawful to ask what is the meaning which the writer intended to convey than to go behind his meaning in order to form an opinion as to what our Lord really said. A modern opinion has not the weight of contemporary knowledge.

2. In his treatment of the Words of Institution one feels that the grounds for dismissing St. Paul's claim to a special revelation from our Lord (1 Cor. xi. 23) are inadequate; but that this matters the less since Dr. Rashdall recognizes that our Lord probably attached meaning to the giving of the Bread which transcended the bare significance of His words (pp. 42-44). Moreover, behind the irreducible minimum of the words recorded by the Evangelists and accepted as authentic by modernists, lie the other words which our Saviour really did say, since it is probable that " This is My Body " and " This is My Blood " were not the only words spoken. If probability, as is so often claimed, is to be our guiding principle, we must suppose that others of an explanatory nature were added, and it will be difficult to find any more probable than those recorded by the Synoptists and St. Paul. It will be more reasonable to accept these than to invent others, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that in so crucial a matter Divine Providence exercised some control or influence over the records of the acts and words of God's Son.

For actions speak as well as words, and even though we take the words in their shortest possible form, " This is My Body, This is My Blood," and connect them with the accompanying actions, the breaking of the Bread and the pouring out and handing round for reception of the Wine, these add a significance to the words, which, when we remember that always in Jewish thought " the blood is the life," and also the way in which it was used in the ritual of the Temple, and in connection with the Passover, at that very time being celebrated, supply a reasonable basis for arguing a very complete sacrificial, vicarious, and expiatory doctrine. In view of these considera-

tions can it be said that to respond to the appeal of our Lord's death is a drinking of His blood? To our Lord's hearers it would mean, when they came to reflect upon the words after His death and resurrection, the reception of His sacrificed life to bring about union with Him, not just the drinking in of His words. It is true that to the ordinary Western mind His words and actions would not necessarily mean this, nor carry with them any expiatory idea, but it is not too much to say that this would not be the case with His hearers. It seems almost inevitable that they as Jews, in whose mind by long training "blood"—at any rate in connection, as here, with a religious rite—was so inseparably connected with the thought of the sacrifice of life in expiation for sin, would certainly attach some idea of expiation to the words as soon as they had time to meditate upon them.

We conclude that our Lord knew that they would understand that participation in His blood-shedding would carry with it expiatory benefits, and that He intended them to do so. He did not only mean that the memory of His martyr death was to inspire them to forsake sin, and we feel therefore that Dr. Rashdall has not succeeded in demonstrating his position; and that, in view of the above considerations, he has gone too far when he claims that "there is nothing in the Gospel narrative of the Institution to suggest that the approaching death was in any way whatever to bring about the forgiveness of sins."

3. Though Dr. Rashdall candidly admits (p. 47) that "many things may legitimately be inferred or deduced from Christ's teaching which He never deduced from it Himself," yet he nevertheless somewhat presses (though certainly not unduly in view of the small residue of such teaching which his textual criticism spares) that if salvation from sin is through His death on the lines taught by the objective theory, Jesus would have given more teaching on so important a point. But in view of our Lord's "self-emptying" of Himself, there is good reason for believing that He Himself did not exactly understand how His death was to bring about man's salvation. It was in this ignorance that the supreme pathos and the perfection of the obedience of His crucifixion lay; and it is here also that His example is so helpful to us when we also are asked by God to suffer in ignorance of the reason why. His obedience stood the most severe of all tests in that though He did not understand why He should be asked to make the greatest of all conceivable sacrifices, yet in darkness He submitted with unfaltering trust to His Father's will. Dr. Rashdall finds no formulated theory in our Lord's teaching as to how His death was to achieve atonement simply because it is

not there to find. Our Lord had no theory to teach, nor was it necessary that He should have. What was necessary was that He should teach the *conditions* on which His atonement could become effective for the salvation of souls, and this He was able to do, and did. But He had no theory of the Atonement as the ground of forgiveness. We have definite evidence for this in the Word from the Cross, " My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me ?" which, even though it is a quotation, was yet a true heart-cry of His soul expressing a real experience. It is one of the most questionable features in Dr. Moberly's great work on the Atonement that he acquiesced in explaining away the full significance of this cry in order to make room for his theory. To bear in mind our Lord's κένωσις in this connection supplies an answer to many of Dr. Rashdall's difficulties.

But he goes farther in his argument against objective views than the argument from silence when he claims that they are actually contrary to our Lord's teaching, since Jesus taught that sins are forgiven for the reason of repentance alone. " There is not the slightest suggestion that anything else but repentance is necessary—the actual death of a Saviour, belief in the atoning efficacy of that death, or in any other article of faith . . ." (p. 26). And from this he concludes that " the only atoning influence that can be recognized in the death of Christ, or in any other aspect of His work, is one which operates by actually helping to produce repentance . . . upon which alone, according to the Master's express teaching, forgiveness depends."

The two chief authorities upon which he relies in taking up this position are the Parables of the Prodigal Son and the Pharisee and the Publican; and in answer it seems almost sufficient to point out that with regard to at least one " article of faith," and that the first and chief one, that the Prodigal certainly had trust in his father's existence and loving, forgiving disposition or he would never have come home; and that the Publican similarly had faith in God and His mercy or he would never have gone up to the Temple to pray. Again, in the case of the " woman who was a sinner," when Dr. Rashdall says it was " because she had much love . . . that her sins had been forgiven, and for that reason alone; no other is suggested," he must have overlooked that our Lord's final words to her were, " Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace." And where, we ask, does Christ give any " express teaching " that repentance is the sole ground upon which " forgiveness depends " ? Dr. Rashdall has no such authority for his statement, which is no more than a mistaken logical deduction based upon grounds

which are not conclusive. It is, moreover, opposed to the teachings of conscience, for though this view may commend itself at first sight when presented to us as a general question and in connection with other people, yet it is a matter of grave doubt whether any true penitent feels that repentance gives him a moral right to forgiveness—that love demands it.

Again, to say that our Lord did not teach the necessity of personal faith or trust in Himself is far from accurate. It is mere "word logic" and quite opposed to the logic of facts. Apart from His acceptance of the declarations concerning His status and Person made by SS. Peter and Thomas, our Lord's demand upon all His followers for absolute surrender to Himself asserts the necessity of faith *in* Himself as distinguished from mere belief in facts *about* Him, and asserts it in the most practical possible way. His disciples must be prepared to die for their faith in Him. So we find faith and works—*i.e.*, apart from acts of Judaic ritual—to be inextricably linked even at the very beginning of the Christian religion, and it is no new doctrine invented by St. Paul when (*pace* Dr. Rashdall) he teaches the necessity of works as well as justification by faith in his earlier as well as in his later epistles—*e.g.*, in such passages as Rom. vi. 13-19; xii. to xiv. inclusive; 1 Cor. xiii.; Gal. v. 13 to vi. 10; Eph. v. and vi.; and Col. iii. and iv. In addition to repentance our Lord was always asking for faith in Himself. "To take up the cross and follow Him" was a demand for absolute trust. It meant much more than "the acceptance of His message" (p. 22); it meant entire self-surrender, and Dr. Liddon has shown with conclusive force how complete were our Lord's claims upon the faith of men.

So that although we may be glad to believe that righteous heathen are even not altogether cut off from the mercies of God for want of a faith in Christ which ignorance makes it impossible for them to attain, yet there is a ground for thinking that such faith in God is required of them as they are able to offer, and one cannot accept Dr. Rashdall's unqualified statements, "forgiveness is dependent upon no condition whatever but repentance" as "the one condition" necessary (pp. 25, 46), and that no belief in "any article of faith is needed" (p. 26). Even though this were true it would be only because an all-holy and all-loving God ought to make it possible for repentance—as the only human offering possible and open to all—to be a sufficient qualification for setting free His holy justice to accept pleas based upon other real and original grounds of forgiveness. Dr. Rashdall, we observe, does not attempt to meet the powerful objections which arise from such general considerations as the moral justice and privilege of reparation,

the inviolability and vindication of law, the higher claims of true love, etc., and his assertion that his doctrine is self-evident will not commend itself to many who have carefully weighed these considerations. They will feel that the doctrine of justification supplies a higher ideal to be worked out by Divine love than any mere forgiveness which ignores or overrides the claims of justice, and they will continue to search for the means by which the Almighty has made it possible. In any case, Dr. Rashdall has failed to establish his doctrine that forgiveness depends upon repentance alone.

P. L. SNOWDEN.

(To be continued.)

GIRLS' DIOCESAN ASSOCIATION: A TWENTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY ADDRESS*

THIS is a wonderful occasion. It does not call for a speech from me, after what we have been given already; but I feel I am here, rather, to try and interpret what is the common mind of the G.D.A. as we stand to-day on a great vantage-point of the Highway of God.

One thing I have learnt in the G.D.A. by most wonderful experience—that is, the sense of a common mind, a conviction or revelation far exceeding anything one could have arrived at by oneself, created by the power of the Spirit through hearts and minds and wills set in one direction and welded together in the throbbing fellowship of the Spirit.

Let us then together, on this great day, seek to express our common desire for what we want the G.D.A. to become; and from this mountain of the Lord, compact with the love and joy and service of thousands of us, see the Promised Land, and set ourselves in the Way to attain it.

If we are honest, we know that we do not want this day to be one of congratulations and beautiful presents. A twenty-first birthday is a wonderfully thrilling thing. Spread before us are presents such as we never dreamt of; some jewels to be gazed at, and wondered at; some gifts full of promise for the future—music, songs, books—calling us to discover their hidden treasure. So to-day we glory in the rich bounties poured on us through this Association, but we cannot stop there. Life opens out before us, shining, wonderful, full of treasures to be explored and possessed in their richness; the Way leads on, glowing, mysterious, towards the Holy City, New Jerusalem. But it is

* An address delivered at a meeting of members of the Girls' Diocesan Association presided over by the Archbishop of Canterbury on November 5, 1921.

not only a happy picnic excursion. In our heart of hearts we know it means climbing, overcoming, trudging, plodding.

It has been well said that Christianity is not a spiritual troubadour wiling men along the Way with alluring lyrics; rather it is a trumpet call summoning men and women to action with flags flying and drums playing. The Christian life is not a delightful meander: it is a route march. I am not ashamed to reproduce this idea, which is not my own, for it is true.

A route march comes from the word "route," and that in its turn from the Latin words *via ruta*, the broken way.

I suppose in every one of us there is a responsive chord to that idea of Christianity as a Way; but are we in earnest about it? Do we want it to be a pleasant flowery path, full of wonderful friendships and alleluias and a far-away vision of Jerusalem; or are we prepared for it to be a Way which goes through the wilderness, and implies hard stones, and hills of difficulty, and valleys of shadow? It is that Way—the broken Way—which leads upward and onward, and I know it is the Way we all long to be worthy to step out on.

Now let us be practical over it. How can we set out on this Way, and equip ourselves as pilgrims who are set on reaching their goal?

We are not expected to go out and choose all the most difficult and disagreeable things by which we may make for ourselves a broken Way. Fortunately the G.D.A. has too much sense of humour to do that! But surely the equipment we all long to take to ourselves as we set out on this new stage of the journey is rather a sense of direction, an attitude to every bit of life, and I will bravely call it by a very old name—the Sense of Responsibility.

We are no longer children; we have come to years of discretion. We have danced very happily along the first meadowy bit of the Way, and now we have to get down to navvy work—as navvies of the Lord—and carve out the Way for ourselves, and for those who will come after.

Do you remember the story of the Roman General who was told by the Oracle that victory should be with the side that gave its General, and who flung himself into the forefront of the line that his blood might blaze the way to victory?

A leader must be one who is ready to surrender all. Every one of us has now got to be prepared to be a Leader, and therefore to face that obligation. In common English it means, Are we ready to give our best in service as a pledge of the reality of our love for God? Life is so crowded with great problems in the State, in international affairs, in the Church, in social relationships, that the only hope is for the best to be given in personal service, in brains, in every gift and talent.

Is the G.D.A. giving its best at this time? That means, Is every single member giving her best?

Let us take that to our hearts before God. No one can judge for another, for no one else knows fully the conditions of home life, health and other claims; but let everyone thus tied ask herself, "Am I giving my best?" first in my own ordinary job, at home, in an office, wherever it may be; and secondly, "Am I giving my best in personal service outside?"

Why is every voluntary philanthropic venture understaffed to-day? Where are the club leaders, those who play dance music, those who sing, the Guiders, the After-Care Visitors, the Sunday-school teachers?

Can they not be mobilized in this glorious route march of Christianity as they were only three years ago as Wrens, Waacs, motor-drivers, War Office clerks, munition workers, V.A.D.'s?

Of course they are there, but we need the great challenge of Christ to the Crusade of the Cross to bring back our lost Sense of Responsibility.

Let us see to it that we of this generation of the G.D.A. remove the stigma, and bind to ourselves the armour of Responsibility for our fellows.

If we have spare time, let us give it where we can give our best; and, having promised, let us stick to it through thick and thin, even though it means treading a way which breaks through invitations to dances, concerts, and everything else that will crowd round the days pledged to other service.

And on this great mountain of God—our day of thanks-giving—let us look out far and wide on the great Highway of God, round which move all nations, races, and languages. Is the G.D.A. giving her best overseas? Well may we be proud of our Roll of Honour, growing month by month, of those serving overseas. But *dare* we preen ourselves on their splendid giving? Some of us know and love those our fellows facing great odds as pioneers and navvies of the Lord in India, Africa, China, Rangoon, Japan; but our love of them and our pride in them must only deepen our Sense of Responsibility not to let them down. The best must be given, not those who can easily be spared. It is just those who are so sorely needed in England that are more needed overseas, where the opportunities are so golden and the difficulties so great that they call for the best to tackle them. Have we each one of us faced whether we are not meant to go overseas? Not because we think we are the best or in any way worthy, but because the world is one, and we shall only do our full service in the place where God means us to be, which may be here, or Africa, or India, or Japan. Who

is going to be ready to seize fresh opportunities which are opening up in every part of the world ?

Not a wild enthusiast who suddenly thinks of going as the furlough month opens. Not a sentimentalist who flies in the face of the best advice, medical and otherwise.

But the people who face it out before God as to which way the road leads, and who then give themselves to the real navvy work for anything up to two years' definite preparation.

With such leaders we shall, indeed, go on to victory, even though the road be marked with marks of suffering, uprooting, and drudgery.

And for the rest of us, who have to stay in England and do our work whole-heartedly here, have we no work in this splendid adventure ?

The collection of funds for Missions, for the fourth worker in Joburg, or for anything else, is not an insuperable problem resting on frantic appeals and tiresome gifts of begrudged half-crowns. Once we have our Sense of Responsibility, it is merely a matter of organization, and that means method and self-denial. I am not here to dictate what way you give your money—there are many, from giving up a box of chocolates, or a new hair ribbon, or a theatre, or something once every week—but in any case let us see to it that we let this Sense of Responsibility govern our money.

It is splendid not to be appealing to an unsympathetic audience, but merely to be the mouthpiece of the G.D.A. everywhere, which feels all this far more strongly than I can say it. That is why there is confidence in our hearts, for we know we are all determined to set out on a new stage of the Way, to bind to ourselves this Sense of Responsibility.

Carlyle in the *Life of Frederick the Great* speaks of these words put up at Cross Roads:

> Others made roads for us,
> We make roads for others,
> Because Christ made a road for us all.

At the cross roads, on a plateau amongst the hills, we stand, grateful, triumphant for the journey so far accomplished, and the wonders which the Way has so far revealed. We turn anew to the shining City on the horizon and face the Way ahead, prepared to carve it out, to get down on our knees, and give all that others too may have a road; and lo ! before us we find the Way marked with footsteps that bleed, and as we kneel and marvel comes the triumphant assurance, " I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life "; " Lo, I am with you all the days "; " I go before you to Jerusalem."

Who follows ?

DOROTHY MAUD.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Two of the four sections of " Papers for the Priesthood " are held over for various reasons until next month; and we publish in their place a communication on the Syrian Christians in South India. We have added to it a prayer used at the induction of Rev. W. E. S. Holland last autumn as Principal of the College at Kottayam, Travancore. It is opportune at this moment when the terms of the proposed union between the Anglican dioceses in Southern India and the South India United Church are before us (*Report of Joint Committee on Union of the Church of England in India and the South India United Church*, S.P.C.K., 6d. net).

The Report deserves careful study; for, though the Bishop of Madras warns us that " the conditions in India are very different from those in England," and that " what is done in South India will in no way commit the Church of England to a definite approval of the interpretation given to " the Lambeth appeal, we cannot be indifferent to the principles underlying the proposals.

Two important second editions have recently appeared. The volume of *Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry* (Macmillan, 15s. net), planned and supervised by Dr. Swete and first published four years ago, is now reissued with an additional Preface from Professor Turner. He insists on the strictly scientific aim of the book, and points out that the novelty in St. Augustine's doctrine of the Succession does not justify the conclusions which some modern scholars have tried to draw from it. The editor and his colleagues are to be congratulated again on a work which will be a lasting monument of Anglican scholarship.

The other work now reissued is the brilliant volume of *Outspoken Essays* (Longmans, 6s. net), by the Dean of St. Paul's; this also with a new Preface. The Dean generously notes that the " essays contain a few outbursts against the Germans which I now know to be unjust." His confident prediction that " the ultimate victory of birth-control . . . will be one of the most momentous changes in the history of morals and of civilization " may be verified in the event; but those who regard this prospect with complacency would do well to read Dr. McDougall's chapter on " The Family Instincts " in his *Introduction to Social Psychology*, and to weigh the judgments of the authorities there cited. Finally, the Dean's statement that " the Churches, especially the Church of England, have gone from bad to worse " will appear to many to rest on very inadequate diagnosis. The conditions of service have more to do with the shortage of clergy than intellectual difficulties over science and religion; and the Dean does little to retrieve the position by speaking of the pastoral vocation as parasitic. Still, it is a delight to read these Essays, even when we most disagree—they enlarge our mental horizon.

Messrs. Mowbray have published in the Alcuin Club Tracts Series *A Directory of Ceremonial* (2s. 6d. net) from the competent hands of Mr. Duncan Jones, Mr. Stephen Gaselee, and Mr. E. G. P. Wyatt. Based

on the Prayer-Book rite, the book sets forth with admirable clearness and simplicity the appropriate ceremonial which shall be both Catholic and English. Both town and country priests will find this book of great value.

PAPERS FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

A.—DEVOTION

By Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, formerly Warden of Liddon House

VII.—PROGRESS IN MENTAL PRAYER

A priest, much experienced in ways of prayer, was saying lately that we are unquestionably passing through "an age of the Spirit," and that, as one result of it, the movement towards supernatural prayer is spreading. This fact is witnessed to by the large number of vocations to the religious life, especially to the contemplative orders. Such an experience seems to be normal in the period following a war. Nor is it confined to the leisured classes. It is by no means uncommon (so one is told) for hard-worked people, who travel to their daily work in trams and omnibuses, to be spending their time on the way in mystical prayer.

If this is the case—and there seems to be no reason to doubt it—it is obviously incumbent on all priests, who have to hear confessions and to guide souls in ways of prayer, to be at least alert to the responsibility entailed on them, and the opportunities given for helping individuals and promoting spiritual growth in our midst. If they merely profess ignorance of the whole matter, and are unable to give guidance to those who ask for it, only urging their penitents to continue in the old ways and to follow the beaten path, repressing the desire for fresh light, it may not only tend to serious damage in that a great spiritual force is wasted, but to the loss of some of our best people, who will either fall into unbelief, or join some other Communion where greater sympathy and knowledge are to be found. The danger is obvious, and its results are seen in many cases of arrested development.

The Essence of Prayer.

Most of us who are conscious of our own shortcomings in the matter will probably admit that our conception of prayer has been too intellectual, stiff, formal; that there has been too little knowledge or desire; that the emotions and the will have had far too little place in it. Disciplined, indeed, these faculties must be, but not discouraged or choked. Nor does this involve the repression of the more intellectual side of the prayer life, but merely the fuller co-ordination with it of love and service, will and desire.

"Walk before Me, and be thou perfect." "Fear not, Abraham, I am thy shield and thine exceeding great reward." This was what the call of Abraham meant—"a contribution, in its own time and stage, to the ultimate formation of the Christian character." This Dean Church calls "the special religious acquisition of Patriarchal times." And here, in this epoch-making call of the Father of the Jewish nation, we find "the type and figure of the religious man. . . . Abraham stands before us, in the

Old Testament and in the New, as 'the friend of God'" (R. W. Church, *Discipline of the Christian Character*, pp. 7, 19).

If this personal, loving intercourse is what the life of prayer meant in the Patriarchal age, it certainly must, even more emphatically, mean this now. It may be that to the fuller recognition of this fact God is specially calling us to-day.

A Priest's Need of Guidance.

What, then, are we doing, what is being done for us, to help us to cherish and deepen these deeper religious experiences in others as well as in ourselves? One brief year, or little more, of a Theological College can do but little, and at present does practically nothing for us, and the busy life of an active parish priest is apt to crowd out such intangible matters.

We cannot be content to accept this as a normal state of things. At least every priest can read some one standard book on the subject, such as, for instance, Fr. Baker's *Holy Wisdom*. It cannot be impossible for, at any rate, deacons and young priests to be gathered together—those who show special aptitude for such work—in conference with some priest experienced in the life of prayer. If nothing of the kind is done we shall blunder along; for mere safety's sake holding our people back to the familiar ways, when God is in all probability by their very difficulties hinting that He has other ways for them to tread, ways that may bring them to a far closer intimacy with Himself.

It is clear that without some such guidance we are sure to make blunders, perhaps serious ones. For there are in this work no obvious or easy methods. There must be the greatest care not to hurry souls, real insight into character, knowledge of the progress or healthy desires of those who ask our help. "By their fruits ye shall know them." For instance, it by no means follows that all those who fail to make progress with meditation are to be encouraged to give it up: such failure may be, and often is, the result of blameworthy sloth or tepidity, or it is quite possible that it is due to "dryness," by which God is in His fatherly wisdom training and deepening some soul. Or again, it is only too easy inadvertently to encourage people to be content with a vacuous state of inertia, or even to expose them to serious spiritual dangers, such as are common to-day. It is God Himself Whom we are seeking: that He may enter in we throw open the windows of our souls; and we throw them open, not as in spiritualism to let in any influence—good, bad, or indifferent—that may come our way, but to Him alone.

B.—IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the inquiry to an expert; a number of

well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

The notice printed above appears this month for the first time. I shall be glad to do anything in my power to make the scheme useful to such as require this kind of help. There are certain classes of students, however, for whom it is not intended. Members of a University or Theological College have a claim upon their professors and tutors, who can, as a rule, direct them to the best books in the course of a few minutes' conversation. Scholars no longer in residence, who are contemplating theses for University degrees, may fairly be expected to find out for themselves what other workers have done in their chosen subjects. Once you have seriously started to work, the difficulty is not to discover what has been written hitherto, but to master the multitude of authorities to which you are referred in the books with which you start. A third class of student is the member of the Central Society of Sacred Study. This excellent Society issues periodical lists of books which provide all—perhaps even more than all—that is required. Members of the C.S.S.S. should, it is suggested, use to the full the facilities provided by their Society.

There remain in all probability students, both in England and abroad, who may be glad to take advantage of our offer. A magazine regularly taken in becomes a familiar companion, even a close friend. There must be thousands to whom the *Church Times*, for example, has become an inseparable part of their life. We hope that THEOLOGY, though it appeals to a far narrower circle, may within that circle become a valued friend, to whom it is natural to appeal for information and advice.

VII.—ONE BOOK OR MANY?

It is a safe rule always to have a book of the Bible on hand, perhaps chosen from Old and New Testaments alternately. But as regards other books, should we read one at a time, sticking to it until it is finished, or have several books on hand at once?

Probably the average priest would be better advised to adopt the latter alternative. The one book may be somewhat distasteful, and it frequently happens that he is not in the mood for it. True heroism would conquer the distaste and make the subject interesting by valiantly taking an interest in it. But our student has learned by experience that he does better work if he humours his moods to a certain extent. Gone for ever are the four hours of uninterrupted morning work which were his lot in college days. His task is to make a wise use of odds and ends of time and of his own limited capacities.

For example: One day he gives an hour in the morning to the Epistle to the Hebrews and Nairne's Commentary. He is then called out, and has no more time till 5 p.m., when he returns for a cup of tea. Evensong is at 6, and there is half an hour to spare. Much as he enjoyed Hebrews in the morning, he feels an invincible distaste at the idea of resuming where he left off. Like a wise man he does not attempt this, but takes up a book of controversial theology lying on the desk. A slip of paper

shows how far he has got, and there is time for one chapter, which he reads with such lively feelings of dissent that no temptation to doze assails him. Another free time comes at 10 p.m. He takes up Sabatier's *Life of St. Francis*. The book is familiar, but he wants to refresh his memory. There will be a communicants' guild meeting a month hence, and an address on St. Francis would be just the thing. But how to get the sunshine of Umbria into Manchester! The best preparation seems to be a leisurely soaking in the deathless story each night before bedtime, in the hope of being able eventually to convey some of the magic to others.

With a little ingenuity the odds and ends of our days can be utilized for good work. Slowness does not matter. Two examples are worth quoting.

In 1871 Adolf Harnack wrote a thesis on Marcion for the University of Dorpat. Publication was necessary, but not being satisfied he kept it by him for revision and improvement. Other tasks claimed his attention, but he never lost sight of the thesis, and *after fifty years*, in 1921, the book at last saw the light.

Archbishop Benson wrote his *Cyprian* in the scanty leisure of a much occupied life. Nothing but the zest derived from doing a genuine piece of research would have given him the heart to do so much work on a Father. A very tired man can follow up a clue or look up a reference when more sustained work is out of the question.

If odd times are to be used to advantage, the necessary books must be ready to hand. The best plan of all is to have a table devoted to books lying open at the right page. No housemaid or landlady must touch the sacred place. When you are not working there, a cloth spread over the books preserves them from dust.

NOTE

THE SYRIAN CHRISTIANS OF MALABAR AND REUNION

If Christianity in Malabar is like ancient Gaul, in that it is divided, it is, alas! very unlike it also, in that three clear-cut divisions by no means suffice.

Of the many lines of separation here, there are two main cross-divisions which may be said to run vertically and horizontally. The first principle which divides these people, vertically, is racial, and it results in Christians thinking of themselves either as "Syrians" or as "Converts" (*i.e.*, from Hindu castes or from outcastes). "Syrians" themselves are divided into two castes, barbarously named "Southists" and "Northists."

Horizontally, the dividing-lines run denominationally, producing—(1) Roman Catholics (either of the Latin or of the Romo-Syrian rite), (2) Jacobites, (3) Nestorians, (4) Anglicans, (5) "Mar Thoma's," (6) Protestants.* The last, however, we may for our purposes eliminate as altogether insignificant in the typically "Syrian" districts of Malabar,

* As for actual numbers, if the total of Christians in these parts is computed at one million (in a total population of four), the denominational percentages may perhaps be set down as follows: Romo-Syrians, 33 per cent.; Latins, 25 per cent.; Jacobites, 25 per cent.; Mar Thoma's, 9 per cent.; Anglicans, 6 per cent.; Nestorians, 1 per cent.; others, 1 per cent. Total, 100 per cent.

which may be said to comprise the Kingdom of Cochin and all but the Southern province of the sister-Kingdom of Travancore. (Kunankulam, near the British border, and Chattanur, a few miles south of Quilon, are the Malabar Syrian's equivalent of "Dan to Beersheba.")

"Converts" are mainly either Latins or Anglicans; both Jacobites and Mar Thoma's, however, are nowadays beginning to include some of these people. Whilst the Latins are exclusively non-Syrian, the Romo-Syrians and Nestorians are purely Syrian; Jacobites and Mar Thoma's are overwhelmingly so; and amongst Anglicans the Syrian proportion is only one-fifth of the total.

The division of all Syrians into Southists and Northists has already been noted: and I would add that intermarriage is along these caste lines, quite unimpeded by and irrespective of any denominational barriers, though of recent years it has been the Roman Catholic practice to assert the latter. But though a Jacobite Northist will without the least scruple marry, say, an Anglican Northist,* no Romo-Syrian or Jacobite Southist will marry a Romo-Syrian or Jacobite Northist. Anglicans and Mar Thoma's, however, have set their face against such unblushing caste system.

Complicated as the above divisions seem, they by no means exhaust the actual state of separation in which all these Christians live. Both Jacobites and Nestorians, for instance, are at present sharply divided into two camps each, according as to whether they accept their respective Patriarch (somewhere in Mesopotamia) or their local Metropolitan as the Executive Head of their Church in Malabar. These "parties" are not in communion and are indulging in litigation which is sapping their physical resources no less than their spiritual. Again, we have divisions which are mere survivals of former quarrels—such as the curious case of the tiny diocese of Anyur, whose Bishop is out of communion with his Jacobite brother-Bishops, whose faith *ex hypothesi* he shares, and yet is in communion with the Mar Thoma Church, whose teaching he must *ex eadem hypothesi* condemn as heretical.

This Mar Thoma Church itself is the result of a lawsuit, which raged in the Jacobite Church during the latter half of last century and resulted in the breaking away of a large portion, and that perhaps the spiritually and intellectually most alert portion, of the Jacobite Church. This portion took the name of "Mar Thoma Church," and to-day may be said to represent the "Evangelical" element amongst the Syrians, and only differs really from Anglo-Syrians in that the former are autonomous, whilst the latter are still largely under English tutelage. Historically the Mar Thoma split was simply the working of the leaven introduced a century ago by the C.M.S. Mission into the Jacobite Church, a leaven remaining there, though its introducers had perforce to withdraw from their ci-devant hosts (the Jacobites) into a local Church of England. Doctrinally there is no difference between Mar Thoma and Anglo-Syrian (who, it must be remembered, all belong to the C.M.S. type of churchmanship): what difference there is is a mere difference of rite. The Mar Thoma's use the Malayalam translation of the Syriac Liturgy of St. James (with careful expurgation of all invocation of saints, prayers for the dead, etc. !), whilst the Anglo-Syrian uses the Malayalam translation of the

* The girl in such cases almost invariably acts on the principle of *cuius uxor, eius religio.*

English Book of Common Prayer: for all that, there is no formal recognition or intercommunion.

Yet, divided as all these people are, there is one piece of comfort at least—viz., that there are none amongst them that are not under the rule of Bishops. Thus there appears to exist already the solid basis of all schemes of Reunion. Moreover, although there may seem to be a cleavage into Sacramentalists (*i.e.*, Roman Catholics, Jacobites and Nestorians) and Charismatists* (*i.e.*, Anglicans and Mar Thoma's): yet, one must thankfully recognize that the separation is not as rigid as it may at first appear. Thus there is a real and deep desire amongst the more thoughtful of the Mar Thoma's for a greater emphasis on the sacramental character of their religion, and the pendulum seems to be swinging back unmistakably from pure Revivalism to historic Institutionalism. On the other hand, amongst the Jacobites also there is a stirring of dry bones. The "Ministry of the Word" has come into its own amongst them with a vengeance; the Syriac of the Liturgy and Offices is gradually being replaced by Malayalam; and there are searchings of heart as to the justification of rites and ceremonies which have become indistinguishable from sheer mumbo-jumbo formalism and magic.

A couple of years ago a "Statement"† was issued, signed by the "Malabar Suffragan and other members of the Mar Thoma Syrian Church." Great publicity was given to this document, which aroused considerable interest in the world outside and seemed to justify all the hopes which had gradually taken shape in regard to Reunion and the leading part to be played therein by the Syrian Church of Malankara.‡ It certainly seemed very natural, and possibly the easiest too, to start Reunion between the various sections, all Episcopalian, of this most ancient Church of Malabar, so that, *l'appétit venant en mangeant*, such domestic reunion might naturally lead to "Reunion All Round"—first in India, then throughout the world. On parallel lines ran the hopes of those who were yearning for an All-Indian Church, of Indians, for Indians, and ruled by Indians, which alone would be able to convert Hindustan into Jesustan: and there again, who could so well take the lead as the Church which for nineteen centuries had been Indian, the Church of SS. Bartholomew and Thomas?

What of such hopes? For one who like myself is in such entire sympathy with the ends hoped for, it is neither easy nor pleasant having to give an unfavourable reply. But from a close study of the facts, for which I have had a perhaps unique opportunity, I can, most reluctantly, yet constrained by a love of truth, but pronounce such hopes as altogether extravagant.

For of all bodies of Christians in the world I truly believe the Syrians of Malabar to be the most fissiparous. A new division—call it sect, call it party, call it rival Church—seems ever ready to spring up, often on no doctrinal provocation at all. This deplorable state of affairs is primarily, I think, due to the fact that hitherto the Syrian has not had, and by law was not allowed to have, any interests at all beyond the animal functions of food and propagation, unless they were of an ecclesiastical

* If I may be permitted to coin this convenient phrase to describe an attitude which emphasizes *χαρίσματα* rather than *μυστήρια*.

† Since published by S.P.C.K. in 1920 as one of their "Documents bearing on the Problem of Christian Unity and Fellowship, 1916–1920."

‡ The official title of the Jacobite Syrian Church.

nature. To take a share in the wider life of the country, be it in politics or even merely in commerce, was denied to him. Education was simply non-existent: therefore the realms of science and art, with all the wider horizons they open up, were likewise *terræ incognitæ*. Thus limited, what outlet had the Syrian for his intellectual alertness and spiritual aspirations, but his Church? And remember, that this Church has always been the Church of a few thousand families, cut off from all living intercourse with the rest of Christendom: and it is easy to understand how this Church lacks altogether the conception of Catholicity; how it necessarily became parochial and, therewith, subject to all the petty feuds and vendettas that arise out of petty parochialism. Up to this day a congregation gets into a temper about something and turns Roman Catholic or Jacobite, as the case may be, with no more thought of doctrinal convictions than an aggrieved customer would have in changing his grocer. With the Indian family system, moreover, the grievance of the individual becomes immediately the grievance of a group and—as there is nothing to turn people's thoughts away from them—these grievances, these jealousies, these fancied insults, are being brooded over and there spring from them strifes, dissensions, schisms, even murders.

However, since the last hundred years the British suzerain power has always exerted itself in the direction of emancipating the Syrians, with the result to-day that, if their complete political equality is not yet theoretically established, yet practically Christians can, and do, fill high positions in the State service and are at liberty to engage in any private pursuits whatsoever. Hand in hand with this process has gone the introduction of universal education throughout the country, with the result that the Syrian of to-day is more and more able to see himself in a perspective denied to an older generation. He engages, very successfully, in commercial ventures; he gains academic distinctions at Madras and Calcutta, at Rome and Oxford. To these men ecclesiasticism can no longer remain the sole interest in life; if—more honour to them—they remain faithful Christians amidst the glamour of new possessions and new discoveries, their Christianity must at the same time lose much of the *furor parochialis* that still passes for true religion amongst the bulk of their fellows. So the leaven, quite a new leaven, is here at work too. The inert mass of the people remain in the ways of old, because they love to have them so. But that generation is beginning to be called old; men, younger in years and in thoughts, are gradually coming to the fore, and the day may not be distant when even here the merits of, say, "Non-Co-operation" will prove of more actual and absorbing interest than the decrees of Chalcedon.

Meanwhile, to expect from these Churches any immediate lead for the Reunion of Christendom seems to me, I can only repeat, grotesque. How can there be Reunion without a passion for Catholicity? How can there be Catholicity without a realization of the shortcomings of an individual Church? And how can there be such realization without an adequate understanding of the principles of one's own position and of those of other Churches? And how can there be understanding, unless the members, or at least the future leaders, of such Church, are taught?

The road from teaching to Reunion is long: but there is no short cut. Let us frankly admit that these people—attractive, kind, and gifted though they be—are in an evil state. If they are to come out of it, they must be helped. But such offers of help have little chance of success or even

of acceptance if they are prompted by ulterior motives of exploitation or domination, instead of by love and an unselfish desire for Christian fellowship; if the souls of these people are treated, not as an end in itself, but as a means to a further end: be that even the conversion of India or the restoration of the seamless robe of our Saviour.

H. C. E. Zacharias.

Kottayam,
Travancore.

A PRAYER

Unite into one flock, O Lord, Thy sheep scattered through the hills and vales of Travancore, that so there may shine throughout the land of India the light that shall usher in Thy reign, and Thou shalt receive the crown of India's worship, in Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Mr. Editor,

I gladly avail myself of your kind permission to write a word of explanation about the review of "God and the Supernatural" which appeared over my signature in the December number of Theology. Considerations of space, I understand, made it necessary for the review to be compressed by the editorial hand, when time was too short to allow of the reviewer being consulted. Inevitably this involved cutting out one or two sections of considerable length. I make no complaint about this, and am only writing to point out what effect such compression had upon the review as a whole. The principal change is due to the removal of all that the original review contained by way of comment on Essays VI., VII., and VIII. These three essays, though not the most striking in the book, dealt with very central matters—Christology, redemption, and the Church. Moreover, the treatment accorded to these subjects, if at all symptomatic of modern Roman tendencies, seemed to afford much ground for hopefulness that Rome was losing some of her rigidity and extreme emphasis upon Latin ways of thought. It was pointed out by the reviewer that Fr. Cuthbert's two essays, starting from the Fourth Gospel, sketched out a Greek rather than a Western view of Christianity, in which "biological" rather than juridical categories are emphasized. The review drew attention to the fact that, starting from Mr. Dawson's emphasis on the New Humanity of Christ in Essay II., this biological and Greek conception of Christianity overshadows the whole of the latter half of the book, giving us a patristic view of redemption and an eirenic presentation of the Church, affecting also the treatment of the Last Things. I do not say that this was so explicitly stated in the review as it is in this letter. But the reviewer intended it to be inferred from his analysis of that part of the book.

The review in its curtailed form is silent about all this. It points out special features in the first half of the book, and then with quaint irrelevancy adds a short note on the last two Essays, which, taken by themselves, are singularly uninteresting.

Yours, etc.,

L. S. Thornton, C.R.

REVIEWS

JACQUES BÉNIGNE BOSSUET. A Study. By E. K. Sanders. S.P.C.K. 1921. 15s. net.

I DOUBT if any English writer except Mr. George Saintsbury—not even Mr. Gosse—knows the French literature of the best age so well, and writes of it so well, as Miss Sanders. Her studies of French ecclesiastical literature and biography are, in their way, masterpieces of solid knowledge and intelligent criticism. It was a little unfortunate that her book on Fénelon came out just at the same time as the singularly brilliant monograph of Lord St. Cyres, but that did not prevent the merits of her work being recognized. It had been hoped that Dr. Figgis had left his lectures on Bossuet sufficiently prepared for publication, but it appears that this is not so, and Miss Sanders has no competition to fear in the biography which now appears from the press. Comparison is natural with the charming essay of M. E. Longuemare (*Bossuet et la Société française*, Paris, 1910), but Miss Sanders, whose aim is more distinctly spiritual, need not fear the association. She has written an excellent book which, in spite of the books with which we were familiar thirty years ago and more, must remain for some time the best English biography of Bossuet.

Solidity and intimacy are its marks. She writes from full knowledge, and she understands the character she draws. Briefly to call attention to the leading features of her book, I would say that she lays special stress on three points. The first is the extraordinary influence, compelling, almost hypnotic, which the idea of monarchy as exemplified in the *grand monarque* exercised upon Bossuet. This did not prevent the preacher using strong and clear language of condemnation, or cause him to relax his efforts to convert his sovereign; but it did cause him always to expect the best, and to interpret ambiguities favourably—perhaps a priest should always do this. He said of his royal master, "De loin, il étonne, de prés il attache"; and that, as Miss Sanders says, sums up the two stages of his relation to Louis XIV.

The second point is the treatment of Quietism and Mme. de Guyon. Here Miss Sanders shows true critical penetration, and her estimate of the positions of the two famous episcopal antagonists is as fair as it is convincing. Perhaps she sees the weakness of Fénelon more clearly than she did some years ago; but she sees the defects of Bossuet too.

The third point is the sound judgment of her general estimate of the character of the great Bishop of Meaux. She shows, more

clearly I think than anyone else has done, not only the mystical and the devotional aspects of his character, but also his failure, admitted again and again by himself, to reach the ideal which was always before his eyes. We are still not unaccustomed to find pious preachers showing arrogant self-assertion, and good men losing their temper if other good men disagree with them. But Miss Sanders in her analysis goes deeper than that, and her portrait of Bossuet is for that reason certain to be of real moral value to all who study it. Historically and psychologically she has written an admirable book. W. H. Hutton.

Studies in Christian Philosophy. By W. R. Matthews. Pp. xiv+231. Macmillan and Co., Ltd., London, 1921. 12s. net.

Lotze's Theory of Reality. By E. E. Thomas. Pp. 1+217. Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1921.

Mr. Matthews's volume of Boyle Lectures may be most warmly commended to all thinking Christian men who are anxious to fulfil the Apostolic injunction to be ready to render a reason for the faith which is in them. There is nothing hard or repellent about the author's style or manner of treatment of his subject, though there is also no "popularization" in the bad sense of the word. Mr. Matthews deals with the most fundamental problems that can possibly be raised in connection with our religion, and he deals with them thoroughly and at the same time so simply as to be readily intelligible to the average educated man, and in a literary style which has the great merit of being graceful and pleasing without conveying any impression of a deliberate pursuit of "style." Fortunately, too, he has no metaphysical system to push, and is quite free from the weakness of some distinguished philosophers who tend to use the Christian faith and the Christian life as mere advertisements for some highly controversial metaphysical set of dogmas. His main concern is to argue that, under all differences on speculative matters, there is a way of looking at life which is fairly to be called Christian in the sense that it is everywhere characteristic, if not, alas! of the practice, at any rate of the aspirations of modern civilized communities, and its absence characteristic of their ancient counterparts, and that historically the inspiration of this Christian view of the world has been drawn from, and is still sustained by, the unique position occupied by our Lord in the personal devotion and life of the members of the Christian community. The argument then proceeds to show that at the root of this whole view of life, and of the significance of our Lord for our own lives, lie one

or two very broad and simple ideas which are properly to be called "philosophical," since they are ideas about the constitution of reality as a whole, particularly the conceptions of ethical theism, of personality as a fundamental character of the Divine nature, and of creation as the relation between God and the world. The alleged difficulties in the way of believing in a single supremely good God, in personality as characteristic of God, and in the creation of the world, are discussed with sympathy and insight, and found to be in the end groundless. One may specially commend that part of the argument of the fourth lecture which deals unanswerably with the contention that just the very hopes for humanity which are dearest to the heart of the "modern" man, and most characteristic of him, are plainly quite unattainable if ethical theism is not the true solution of the "world-riddle." One looks forward with very keen anticipation to the subsequent courses of lectures, in which the central topics are to be Revelation and Incarnation.

If it is permissible to indicate any points of dissent from an author whom one finds in general so admirable, I should like to mention just two matters on which it may not be easy for all of us to see eye to eye with Mr. Matthews. It is not quite clear to me that when he makes the hope of continual progress, as opposed to a mere maintenance of the *status quo* or to cyclical recurrence, a feature of modern views of life which is absent from those of the ancient world and is directly due to Christian inspiration, he is not thinking of endless progress on this planet and under the ordinary conditions of secular history. If he is, is not any such anticipation in violent opposition not only to the known views of the early Church, and apparently of our Lord Himself, but to the whole historical Christian tradition down to a very recent time? I suspect that some of the things which Mr. Matthews says in this connection about the great Greeks have been too much taken on trust. When I am told that Plato never really attained to a genuine Theism, I ask myself whether a man who can make this statement has ever read the *Laws*, or has preferred to take his theories about Plato from some German handbook. And when I am told that the "democracies" of the Greek world were really aristocracies of slave-holders (and Mr. Matthews is not alone in this fancy), I cannot help wondering whether the authors of such a remark have studied Aristophanes and the orators.

Mr. Thomas's work on Lotze is opportune as filling a real gap. A great deal has been said from time to time by critics in our own language about Lotze's logical views and his theory of knowledge, and there has been a good deal of attention paid,

as was only natural, to his vigorous defence against both materialists and "absolute idealists" of the genuine reality of the human soul and its interior life. But no one as yet has dealt systematically with the question of Lotze's general conception of the real world and what goes on in it, the consistency of his views, as expressed in a long series of works, with one another, and the difficulties which beset them. This is the theme of Mr. Thomas's work, which is marked by very full knowledge of Lotze's principal writings and great closeness of argumentation. Future students of the last of the great "systematic" German philosophers are certain to find the book exceedingly useful. Possibly Mr. Thomas falls a little short of being the perfect critic. I am not sure whether he has made the effort of imaginative "sympathy" needed to appreciate a system of thought as it appears to its author. A good deal of the criticism leaves on me the impression of coming a little too much from the "outside." And one is also a little baffled at times by not being able to discover from what precise point of view the criticisms are urged, whether they spring from a definite conviction about the character of reality incompatible with Lotze's or are merely a collection of "sceptical doubts" with no definite central thought behind them. But, however that may be, the points are well taken and well argued, and, though the book would be hard reading for any but special students, it should not be neglected by anyone who is really intent on understanding and appreciating Lotze's thoughts.

A. E. Taylor.

Space, Time, and Deity: The Gifford Lectures at Glasgow, 1916-1918. By S. Alexander. 2 Vols.: pp. xvi+347; xiii+437. Macmillan and Co., London, 1920.

The pages of Theology are no proper place for the full examination of Professor Alexander's monumental work, even if the writer of these lines were competent, as he is not, to undertake the task. Professor Alexander, with admirable courage, has attempted to lay down the general outlines of a theory of reality and to show, from a mind stored with wide reading in every department of knowledge, how the theory can be successfully applied to everything in heaven and earth from the crudest mechanical movements up to the "being than whom none better can be conceived" of the saints' adoration. In the brief space which is permitted me I can hardly say more of the execution of this gigantic task as a whole than that Professor Alexander has touched no subject without adorning it, but, as I conceive, does not adorn all the many subjects of

which he treats with equal brilliance, and that, while I find repeated ground for admiration in many sections of his work, I still feel that he never succeeds in producing conviction of the truth of his main thesis. That thesis is, indeed, stated at the outset modestly enough as an hypothesis, and we are invited simply to consider whether, if true, it may not give an adequate account of all the facts of nature and of life. But it is not long before the author seems to glide insensibly from the contention that his hypothesis *can* account for all the known facts to the very different assumption that it is the *only* one which can do so. The main position of the whole book is never expressly proved, probably because Professor Alexander at heart holds that one has only to follow his analysis to see it directly *in* the facts. It may be so, but if one has not the vision, another man's claim to possess it necessarily leaves one unconvinced. One cannot live by an "act of sight" any more than by an "act of faith" which is not one's own personal act.

I propose, therefore, to occupy most of the brief space allowed me in merely raising one question. I will not ask whether Professor Alexander's main theory is true, or even whether, if true, it does justice to all the "appearances" a theory of reality is bound to take account of. I prefer to raise the special question whether, true or false, the theory does justice to the facts of the religious life in particular. Is God, as God must be conceived of if the main theory be sound, such a God as the saints of the world, whether Christian or not, worship, and from living personal relation to whom they at least believe themselves to draw the inspiration which sustains their lives? Professor Alexander himself is quite explicit on the point that it is the duty of the metaphysician to take full account of religion as a great feature of human life as it really is, not to palm off some spurious substitute under the same name, and thus he cannot possibly object to the application of this test to his own theory.

I am obliged, of course, in the first place, to state what the theory, as I understand it, is, and I have to do this with a brevity which forbids all support of my interpretation by references. But I trust I shall succeed in avoiding any serious unintentional misrepresentation. The general theory is of a type ancient enough, though expressed in terms of the very latest physical and psychophysical speculation. The ultimate reality in the universe is nothing but what Professor Alexander calls Space-Time, though it will be more familiar to most persons under the name Motion. The universe consists of motions, some simpler, some more complicated, and it seems to be assumed that, in order of time, the simpler ones come

first. If you could go back far enough, you would get a universe without matter and without mind, consisting simply of a chaotic medley of simple motions. Gradually this medley, for a reason which I do not find clearly explained, organizes itself into regular patterns. What we call "matter" is a relatively simple pattern of motion. As time goes on, within the simple patterns there arise more complex patterns, each complex pattern being the appearance of something definitely new in the world's history. Thus "mere" matter, by simple increase of complexity of the motions of some of its parts, gives rise to matter with "sensible" properties, such as colour and fragrance, this to bodies with life, and this again to living creatures with minds. My mind is thus, strictly speaking, the same thing as my brain, or rather, as a special portion of my brain, a peculiarly complicated pattern of motion within the whole larger and simpler pattern I call the "organism." Now it is Professor Alexander's thesis that this production of ever-increasing complexity of patterns of motion goes on endlessly. In the course of time something must "emerge"—a favourite word of the author's—which stands to my mind in the same sort of relation in which my mind stands to my body. This next most complex pattern to Mind is Deity. It follows, it must be noted, that as it could never have been predicted from mere knowledge of the patterns of motion which come before Mind what Mind itself, when it "emerged," would be like, so we strictly cannot say at all what Deity will be like. We know only that it is what will come after Mind. Again, just as the tendency of the universe to the production of the new, which led from the mere existence of bodies to that of living bodies, and from this to the existence of minds, succeeds only in producing finite individual organisms and minds, so the same tendency can only lead to the "emergence" of finite "gods" of the polytheistic kind; the God who is "King of kings and Lord of lords" is, so to say, a king of whom the universe is always in travail but will never have the strength to bring forth.

I must not here call attention to the numerous difficulties which might be raised about this whole conception of a stuff which, for reasons to me unintelligible, gives itself an endless series of ascending forms. I will only ask the question whether Professor Alexander provides us, as he himself owns he is bound to do, with a possible object of real worship. For my own part, I feel bound to hold that he does not. For, whatever the word "worship" may mean to another, to me at least it means an attitude of absolute devotion which at the same time gives the worshipper an absolute confidence and strength. I cannot feel this either towards Professor Alexander's "gods"

or towards his "God." Not towards the latter, because I can draw no strength from what I am supposed to know to be the "most *unreal*" being. Not, again, to the former, for all I know about them is that it is quite unknown what sort of thing Deity may be, and I cannot see why, when they appear, they might not be precisely what I should call devils or powers of darkness rather than "angels" or "gods." Nay, I do not even see why they should ever "emerge" at all. I cannot see that Professor Alexander has given any reason to suppose that the capacity for the production of new forms is inexhaustible. Why may not the "emergence" of Mind be succeeded by a process with the reverse rhythm, a reduction of things to the supposed former medley of simple motions? Is Professor Alexander not uncritically assuming that the temporal advance must be, if not from worse to better, at least from less to more complex? I could understand this attitude in an ethical Theist who regards "evolution" as guided all through by a perfect intelligence standing outside the whole process; in Professor Alexander it strikes me as no more than an unreasoned prejudice. His heart is unreservedly on the side of good, but his theory, as far as I can see, lends no support whatever to *raisons de cœur*.

The other point I must mention in even so cursory a notice is this. It is part of the theory that the newer and more complex can only arise in and subsist in the simpler which stands to it as body to mind. Hence Professor Alexander expressly declares that if any soul has ever survived its body his whole metaphysic has been refuted by fact. It seems to me at least rash to pin one's whole philosophy so absolutely to the assumption that Christ is *not* risen from the dead, and that not simply because the external evidence the other way impresses me as unusually strong, but because the very undeniable reality of the life of the Christian in all ages does seem unintelligible apart from a personal relation to one who is "alive for evermore."

My own conclusion, then, is that, unless the interior life of the Christian believer is to be excluded from the phrase "the religious consciousness," there is at least one great system of facts to which Professor Alexander's metaphysical hypothesis can do no justice at all—the facts of the "religious consciousness." This is not to say that I would not have theologians give serious study to Professor Alexander's volumes. I cannot believe that his central hypothesis has much of a prospect before it, but I am sure that there is a great deal that is of real and permanent value in his volumes for readers who will set themselves in earnest to discover just where it is to be found.

A. E. Taylor.

NOTICES

RECENT STUDENT MOVEMENT BOOKS.

THE Student Christian Movement has become so much a recognized element in the religious forces of our country that special interest attaches to its publications. They are intended for the young men and women in our Colleges and Universities—for the *élite* of our educational system, that is to say, at their most impressionable age—though, of course, this does not preclude a wider public still. They afford, therefore, some index to the student mind of to-day and its needs, and to the way in which some at least of the Movement's leaders think they may be met.

The books before us are of different types. Dr. Glover's *The Pilgrim* (S.C.M., 6s. net) is called by the author Essays on Religion, and consists of a dozen studies of scenes, lessons, or personalities in the Christian tradition, particularly in the Gospels. Dr. Maclagan's *The Gospel and its Working* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.), Mr. Richard Roberts's *The Untried Door* (S.C.M., 5s.), and Dr. H. R. Mackintosh's *The Divine Initiative* (S.C.M., 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d.) are all in varying degrees expository and homiletic; though, as we should expect, the expository and definitely doctrinal element in the last-named greatly prevails. Finally, Mr. T. W. Pym, the Head of Cambridge House, presents in 139 pages a suggestive study of *Psychology and the Christian Life* (S.C.M., 4s.).

Their authors would not take as a compliment any indiscriminate praise we might be disposed to give to these books; and, in fact, we take too serious a view of their responsibility and aim to do any such thing. All are good of their kind; sincere, earnest, candid, and full of conviction that somehow our Lord provides the key to right living. But, with one exception, we are inclined to be critical of the kind. That exception may be mentioned at once: it is Dr. Mackintosh's *The Divine Initiative*. Brief as it is, this is a fine book, and one for old as well as young. The author knows his own mind—knows what the Christian Gospel is, and bears witness to it as the act and message of God. He lays especial stress on the Divine "priority of action" illustrated in Revelation, in the Incarnation, and in the faith of the individual. When he describes faith as "the obedient and grateful apprehension of God in Christ," he has framed a definition which will stand searching criticism. We only regret that Dr. Mackintosh is not more ready to make use of the term "grace," which is so often the word just called for by his exposition, and is surely as central to Christian terminology as any of those which he explains.

Mr. Pym's book we have called "suggestive": we dare not say more. It is useful to have the teachings of the Nancy School brought into contact with the failures and hopes of Christian life; and we thank him for pointing out how the sinlessness of our Lord bears testimony, in the light of modern psychology, to the character of the Mother who was called to "form His mind and order His environment" in early years. Our chief criticism of the book, however, lies in another direction, and is indicated by the bibliography at the end. Among books recommended there or referred to earlier no mention is made either of Dr. McDougall's *Introduction to Social Psychology* or of Mr. Shand's *Foundations of Character*. We regard that as a most serious omission. And for this reason. Nothing is more vital for young men and women at College than that they should

study the essential principles of any science before they pass to their application. They must learn the accepted terminology and the assured results of modern work in any field of knowledge they approach. Only so can they form the habit of accurate and conscientious thinking. And Mr. Pym is very free, both in his use of terms (such as "instinct") and in his analysis of personality. This does not make the book less interesting; but it does impair its usefulness for undergraduates. Particularly is this the case with undergraduates well disposed towards religion. For what their enthusiasm most needs is the discipline of theory, if it is to grow into a robust faith. We suspect that none of Mr. Pym's chapters will wear so well in life as the few pages where Dr. McDougall treats of Reverence or of Gratitude.

Similar objections may be urged against Dr. Glover's book, though the field of knowledge is a different one. Dr. Glover is trying to write theology as though there had never been any theologians before him; or rather to cast away their cumbersome constructions as so much false accretion on the central Truth of Christ. The result is a picture of our Lord and His teaching which does great justice to the learning and literary insight of the author, but leaves us completely in the dark as to our Lord's place in the scheme of things. Yet it is just that which we want to know. Appreciation of our Lord is not the same as faith. It does not grow into faith, until it brings the whole man into play. And the whole man, if he is alive to the world he lives in (as College students should be) demands a *Credo*.

Dr. Glover's attitude to Christ, as revealed by *The Pilgrim*, is, in fact, sentimental rather than rational; and in this he is in line with the Liberal Protestant tradition. In the transition from *The Jesus of History* to this later book we see how Ebionism developed. Its antidote is the Gospels. St. Mark's Gospel alone is enough, if it be fairly read. But the Church has four Gospels, and not one, nor even three. What we are dealing with now in Liberal Protestantism is not merely a preference for the Synoptic Gospels to the Fourth as historical sources, but an interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels which is inconsistent with the tenor and meaning of the Fourth. The result is a partial faith; and it is a line of thought which surely cannot satisfy for long. Its span will depend on how soon scholars can get to work on the content of the Johannine writings. For St. John presents a Saviour so sufficient for all the needs of heart and head, that we shall be satisfied with no other; and men will recognize Him not only as the Jesus of history, but also as the Christ of the Catholic Faith.

E. G. Selwyn.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER